

# THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 2.—APRIL, 1889.

## I.

### ROTHE AND SWEDENBORG.

"The Arabians say that Abul Khain, the mystic, and Abu Ali Seena, the philosopher, conferred together; and on parting, the philosopher said, 'All that he sees, I know;' and the mystic said, 'All that he knows, I see.'"

EMERSON.

"God's gift was that man should conceive of truth  
And yearn to gain it, catching at mistake.  
As midway help, till he reach fact indeed."

—BROWNING.

THE design of this article is to set forth some of the coincidences of view to be found in the writings of Dr. Richard Rothe, one of the leading German theologians, and of Emanuel Swedenborg, the most famous mystic of modern times. In Germany, a place is assigned to the former, next to Schleiermacher, as the greatest theological thinker of that land. He took up into himself, in full measure, the essential elements of European philosophical research, and sought to turn all to account in the interest of Christian doctrine and life. To what extent he was imbued with the then reigning systems is evident from the charge made by some of his critics, that his

writings aimed at a reconciliation of the antagonistic views of Hegel and Schleiermacher; and from that of others, that all that he did amounted to an adaptation of some of the principles of Schelling's *gnosis* to the ethics of the last-named great theologian. Apart from his position as a teacher, so towering and influential, the fact of his thorough training in the leading speculative schools, and of his exhibiting the vastest power of independent, abstract and purely dialectic thought, attaches no little interest to a comparison of him with the great mystic whose name we have placed beside his at the head of this article. This interest is increased by the consideration that Swedenborg's training was primarily of a practical nature. At an early age he was in the employ of his government, and won exceptional distinction for his success in promoting its material interests. It is well known that in the department of physical science he made original investigations, the value of which secures for him a name among the greatest naturalists of his own or any other age.

Both were devout men. Upon the youthful minds of both were impressed the essential truths of our holy religion. These Rothe never forgot when, as a recluse, he did what, with characteristic modesty, and with something like self-reproach, he confesses he could not help doing, namely, give himself over to the most rigid methodical and logical *thought*; nor did Swedenborg, when, as a busy man of the world and as a foot-sore pioneer in the by-paths of nature, he surrendered himself to what men generally call his propensity to *dream*. Of course, as intelligent Christian men, they had much in common. As agnosticism is so fashionable, and the opinion so prevalent that the theory of evolution precludes the necessity, on the part of *thoughtful* people, of inquiring about a divine Creator and Governor of the world, it may seem surprising to some, that in these days a keen, comprehensive and profound metaphysician like the one, and a gigantic gatherer and original investigator of physical facts and principles like the other, should be so downright and outspoken in their adherence to

a belief in a personal God, in a revelation of Himself in His word, in the incarnation of His Son, in the efficacy of prayer and in a world of departed spirits, which all men must enter to receive according to the things done in the body. Mr. Ingersoll would doubtless condescend to hope that it goes well with them in the unknown world; for he seems inclined to indulge in that measure of piety on special occasions. The readers of this REVIEW will be prepared to believe that they are with their Saviour in glory. But should Swedenborg's doctrine prove true, that in the heavenly world there are innumerable distinct societies, each consisting of those who, whilst upon the earth, were of kindred mind and zealous in similar pursuits, it will appear, from what follows in this article, that we have ground for concluding that we will find them there in much closer proximity than from a superficial glance at the men and their writings we would be apt to suppose.

#### SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE.

Regarding the sources of theological knowledge, the two writers seem to hold views of which those of the one are directly opposite to those of the other. And here, strange to say, as over against the great mass of Protestant Christians, they agree in one most fundamental and important point. What is the source of such knowledge? The plain-minded believer as well as many so-called orthodox theologians, are ready to reply unhesitatingly: The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the source and the *only* source of theological knowledge. But we hear Roman Catholics, Rationalists, Swedenborg and Rothe unanimously and most positively saying *no*. The first-named regard tradition as divinely authoritative in all matters of faith and practice. The next class emphasize reason in the same way. Swedenborg claims direct miraculous illumination. Rothe's position here is somewhat singular. He attaches the greatest importance to tradition, rightly understood and used, as contributing to our knowledge of the divine mind and will. When speaking at times of

the value of independent rational thought, one might suppose that he regarded this by itself, as an adequate authority for all that it is necessary for us both to know and do. Whilst at the same time he holds that the gift of divine supernatural illumination at the present day is neither impossible nor improbable, and that in this age of the church there are more charismatically endowed prophets than men generally are inclined to believe.

Rothe attaches the greatest importance to speculative research in the sphere of theology. Knowledge of essential and vital significance pertaining to divine things is to be obtained in this way. Of the different departments of theological science, speculative theology, in his view, is the head; historical theology, including dogmatics and exegesis, is the main body, whilst practical theology forms the hands and feet. He assumes that with the consciousness of self is given to man a consciousness of God.\*

With this consciousness of God as a basis or germ, he professes to unfold a complete system of the universe, including theology proper, cosmogony and ethics. This is done according to the most rigid *a priori* or synthetical method. Every step taken must implicitly involve the next following; and none dare be taken which is not necessarily required by what precedes. The movement must go forward according to the inexorable logical law of deduction, let the outcome be what it may.

\* The author of the article "Theology" in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," referring to this postulate of Rothe, says he is wrong. Another distinguished Englishman says he is right, and in the following forcible way:

"Question, answer presuppose

Two points: that the thing itself which questions, answers,—is, it knows;

As it also knows the thing perceived outside itself,—a force

Actual in its own beginning, operative though its course,

Unaffected by its end,—that this thing likewise needs must be;

Call this—God, then, call that—soul, and both—the only facts for me.

Prove them facts? that they o'erpass my power of proving, proves them such.

Fact it is I know I know not something which is fact as much.

—BROWNING.



Should the thinker at any point in his progress find his statement in conflict with biblical doctrine, the dogmas of the church, or the commonly accepted opinions of men, however prevalent, he must not stop, but move on, looking neither to the right nor the left, until he reaches the point of departure, whilst his labors thus must result in a harmonious and fully-rounded embodiment of theological truth.

Rothe has been most terribly misunderstood. Perhaps no theologian more so, unless, according to the representations of some of his friends, it would be Swedenborg himself. He has been charged with claiming that his speculations have their counterpart in all particulars in objective reality. At this he is amused, and expresses surprise that any one should take him for such a "presumptuous fool."\*

Who, he says, could entertain the idea for a moment that one poor mortal by himself could think commensurately with the being of God and the universe, the work of His hands? I only attempt to do, in my feeble way, what of necessity must be done, leaving to others more capable of doing the work better, until the time, surely to come, will come when the task will be adequately performed. The science of theology never has dispensed with speculation, and never has been able to do so, however much it may have been blinded to the fact; and never was there a period in its history when the duty of attending to this work was so imperatively imposed upon it as at the present day. Only let him who believes himself equipped for this employment and feels called to undertake it, contribute his mite in the spirit of humility; let him ever be able, with an impartial eye, to regard his system as an objective production, and should he find it to be in conflict with the sacred Scriptures, the legitimate doctrines of the church, or with the facts of empirical observation, let him be prepared, seeing that somewhere he has made a mistake, to break it to pieces, and, undismayed, to go to work to build up anew.

\* "*Eingebildeter Thor.*"

Swedenborg speaks in an altogether different tone in regard to the message which he brings. In one sense he is modest enough. He has nothing to say of and from himself. He is only a passive earthen vessel, but one through whom, as a vehicle, are conveyed to mortals truths declared to be hitherto absolutely unknown, but of vital and eternal significance. There is an absence of self-consciousness in his writings which render them unique. One knows hardly where to look, in all literature, for anything like them in this respect. Passages striking, profound and weighty are followed by others which seem to the reader trivial, flat and insignificant, but the writer hurries on without any apparent concern as regards the light in which the reader will view him. Whether he astounds you by confronting your imagination with some unearthly vision, or shocks you by a rude thrust at one of your cherished convictions in the use of a loathsome comparison, or startles you by a flash of light illuminating one or another of the profound mysteries of human nature, or elevates by a poetical flight worthy of a Milton, or wins your heart by a paragraph containing an important truth shining through language remarkable for its crystal-like clearness, simplicity and beauty, and which you would be glad to see in the next child's-paper that comes into your children's hands—all this is a matter of equal consequence to Swedenborg, for these are the forms which, independently of his thinking, the message assumes which he was commissioned to deliver. Again and again he compares himself to St. John on Patmos, and St. Paul when caught up into the third heavens. Not only are revelations made through him of saving truths hitherto unknown, but the form in which they come from his pen remains unchangeably valid for all time, and is recognized as such in the heavenly world. Our Lord, before His crucifixion, promised His disciples that He would come again, and to this return His people in all ages of the world have been looking forward with confiding hope. On this subject Swedenborg has the following, taken from "The True Christian Religion," No. 779:

"Since the Lord cannot manifest Himself in Person, as just shown above, and, nevertheless, has foretold that He will come and found a new church which is the New Jerusalem, it follows that He will do this by means of a man who can not only receive the doctrines of this church with the understanding, but can also publish them by the press. That the Lord manifested Himself before me, His servant, and sent me to this office, and that He afterwards opened the sight of my spirit, and so has intromitted me into the spiritual world, and has granted me to see the heavens and hells, also to converse with angels and spirits, and this now uninterruptedly for many years, I testify in truth."

Accordingly, the difference between Rothe, the thinker, and Swedenborg, the seer, amounts to this: that all the thoughts which in the *speculative system* of the former are investigated and developed, are produced by his own thinking purely out of himself, nothing being given him from without; \* whilst the thoughts expressed in the writings of the latter are in no sense self-produced, but divinely and absolutely *given*. In this respect, they may be said to be the antipodes the one of the other.

Before leaving the topic of the sources of theological knowledge, a passing glance may be allowed at the difference between the views of these writers on the subject of the Sacred Scriptures. Rothe's celebrated articles in the "*Studien und Kritiken*" of 1859, on Revelation, Inspiration and the Bible, made a profound impression on the theological public of Germany, and, as since published in a volume entitled "*Zur Dogmatik*," are recognized as among the ablest treatments of these *loci* yet given to the Church. He holds that there is such a thing as a divine self-manifestation, also an inspiration consisting in a state of mind divinely prepared for the reception of the former,

\* "Aber die Gedanken, welche der Spekulirende mit seiner Reflexion untersucht und entwickelt, sind lauter von seinem Denken selbst lediglich aus sich selbst heraus erzeugte, demselben nicht von aussér ihm hergegebene." *Ethik* § 2, Anm. 1, 2te Auflage.

but denies that the Sacred Scriptures are inspired, and that they constitute Revelation. Accordingly, he concludes that they are in no sense the Word of God, but the word of men: that and nothing more. They contain the revelation consisting of the two factors above mentioned, but the contents of this must be reached through human agencies,—for example, the grammar, the dictionary, together with the results of textual criticism and similar scientific apparatus. These last, according to Swedenborg's way of looking at things, in so far as they stand over and above the Scriptures, are the hammer and the axe which the law forbids being brought in contact with the temple, it being the symbol of the Word. It is not to be wondered' at that many of Rothe's earnest-minded readers exclaimed: "If the foundations be removed, what shall the righteous do?" By the way, he concedes that some of the New Testament writers regard those of the Old Testament as inspired, in a sense similar to that in which the word is used in the Post-Reformation confessional standards; but adds, that in this they were mistaken.

Although Swedenborg found the entire Church "consummated," as he calls it, that is, involved in spiritual ruin, and hence explains the necessity of the New Church originated through his instrumentality, still there is one doctrine for adherence to which, on the part of the Old Church, we never hear him finding fault with it, namely, that of what is now called its mechanical inspiration theory. He holds that an angel stood by each prophet of the Old Testament and dictated what to write. The divine instructions extended as far as the formation of the letters, even the curvings of which are not without significance. It was Swedenborg's great mission to make the disclosure that the Scriptures have a threefold sense, namely, beside the literal one, a spiritual and heavenly sense. In the two latter they are understood by the two corresponding orders of angels, and by some mortals, according to the measure of their love and faith and the character of the conjunction of the one with the other. The mass take the Scriptures in the literal sense and in so doing enjoy consocia-

tion with the angels. But some portions of the Word, as, for example, the first part of Genesis, and almost the entire Book of Revelation, have but little meaning unless taken in the higher sense. He was divinely commissioned to reveal their hidden meaning.

#### GENERAL VIEW OF THE UNIVERSE.

Both of these writers undertake to present a scheme of the universe including the sidereal worlds and the realm of spirits. Each professes that his system is self-consistent throughout; that it is not contradicted by any established facts or truths, however apparently at variance with it; and that in the light of it, confusing difficulties are more readily solved than in any other way. From the time that Rothe first projected his general theory, he saw it confirmed constantly more and more by the current of history at large, the disclosures of science and its practicability in all cases where its principles were tested by their application to various ecclesiastical and secular situations. Swedenborg carries his system into the remotest corners of the universe, and sees it revealed in every object, whether it be a pebble or an archangel. Any one who undertakes to follow him will experience something like a sense of the sublime to see him flying from one sphere of existence to another, absolutely confident, not only that he will find elucidation and confirmation of his doctrine, but that he carries with him the torch which illumines the darkness of unknown recesses of nature and throws into shade the lucidity by which facts supposed to be known are pervaded. Both start out with the divine love as the motive cause of the existence of all things outside of the Creator. This love is not satisfied until a being is brought into existence who is endowed with understanding and will, and is thus capable of being taken up into living union with the divine Being. To effect such union, He, as the God-man, enters the sphere of the creature, and brings to pass an order of existence consisting of life and light, in which man dwells with God and God with man. This in-dwelling of God in

the creature; or, according to his own expression, "God's cosmical abode," is for Rothe, heaven; and Swedenborg everywhere teaches that in so far as man enters into conjunction with the Lord, made possible by His coming in the flesh, he is in heaven. According to the conception of the former, sanctification consists in the spiritualization of the material elements in any way belonging to man (and this is the fundamental and distinguishing thought of his ethics), which advances in proportion as he holds himself receptive to the inflowings of the divine, which is but the counterpart of resisting and negating the claims and influences of matter in and around him. According to Swedenborg, Regeneration, which is man's life-work, consists in letting heaven in by keeping hell out. The end of the entire process is reached when man's material body is laid aside and he enters the spiritual world, where full room is made for that adequate in-dwelling of the divine in the human and human in the divine, which constitutes the full and complete return of the creature to the Creator, or the taking up into itself of the creature on the part of the Creator, which was aimed at in the original or eternal movement of the divine love. The primordial purpose, according to Rothe, was to evolve a perfectly organized complexus of dematerialized intelligences, permeated at every point by the divine Spirit, in the form of understanding and will, thus filled with the divine light and reflecting the divine glory; whilst according to Swedenborg, it is to people heaven with glorified spirits, for which all earths are seminaries.

It is perfectly apparent how both expose themselves to the charge of pantheism. Both would say, Rothe with a diffident smile, Swedenborg with a prophet's scorn, "Yes; call the system pantheism, if you only knew what you are talking about." Both were intensely reverential and devout; both were animated by the deepest love for the Lord Jesus Christ and the lost souls of men; both come before the reading and thinking world with what the one calls a confession, the other a promulgation, in the form of systems, alike almost, perhaps entirely,



unparalleled for their comprehensiveness of grasp, harmoniousness of details and power of exhibition, but alike also in being as far from what the vulgar mass call pantheism as light is from darkness.\*

As the systems of the two men resemble each other so closely, it will not be a matter of surprise, if we find them coinciding in a number of the *loci* which constitute the body of Christian doctrine. Whilst we confine ourselves to but a few of these, selecting those in which they differ from the traditional and generally accepted views, we are well aware that a far more minute and complete account of them than at present is admissible would prove both interesting and instructive.

#### THE BEING OF GOD.

Rothe has much to say of the pure being of God. He thus designates what the Christian consciousness calls for as the divine incomprehensibility. He distinguishes between it and what he calls *das göttliche Dasein*, by representing the former, which he calls "*das göttliche Wesen*," as being *in potentia*, what the latter is *in actu*. This distinction is of vital importance in his system, for it constitutes the first step, which enables him to go forward according to the dialectic process which he learned from Hegel. What he calls "*das eine Sein*" or "*Wesen Gottes*," he finds in the theologians of the early church and in the later theosophists; but with them it comes in as an after-consideration, but nowhere does he find the primary importance attached to it which it has in his eyes, and nowhere does it appear as the necessary counterpart of the "*Dasein*," the two taken together resulting in the only adequate conception of God, and constituting the sole proper corner-stone of every speculative theologi-

\* Everybody knows that the pantheism of the philosophers, as well as that of the common herd, denies personality to the Deity. "Those," says Rothe, "who refuse personality to God should, in so far as they allow an affirmative conception of God to hold at all, think what they are doing . . . It is impossible to think anything at all of an impersonal 'absolute,' least of all to think of such as a being for whom one can have respect, or toward whom one can have love and confidence." *Ethik* § 81., Anm., Auf. 2.



cal system deserving of the name. Strange as it may sound to the uninitiated reader, Rothe is forced to say that the thought of the pure being of God put in the form of a thesis would be this: "God is not what He is."\* This has the ring of *German speculation* indeed.

But hear what the Swede had said nearly a century before: "Because the Lord is uncreate and infinite, He is *Esse* itself, which is called Jehovah." Further: "Where *Esse* is, *Existere* is; one is not possible apart from the other. For *Esse* Is (mark the capitals) by means of *Existere*, and not apart from it.† This the rational mind comprehends when it thinks whether there can possibly be any *Esse* which does not *Exist* (these last italics are ours), and whether there can possibly be *Existere* except from *Esse*."‡ Again: "*Esse* is not *Esse* unless it Exists, because before this it is not in a form, and if not in a form, it has no quality; and what has no quality, is not anything."|| Similar statements occur again and again in Swedenborg, but perhaps nowhere more explicitly than in "The True Christian Religion," No. 21. That Jehovah God is *Esse* in itself, is because He is the I AM, the Itself, the Only and the First, from eternity to eternity, from which is everything which

\* His language is "Nur wenn Gott, das was er ist, wesentlich zugleich nicht ist, Kann er dar Absolute oder Gott sein." *Ethik.*, § 24, Ausgabe 2. Brown- ing places this way of looking at the subject in an amusing light, when, in his "Christmas Eve," he puts the following language into the mouth of the Göt- tingen professor, discoursing on the Christ Myth:

"Demanding from the evidence  
(Since plainly no such life was liveable)  
How these Phenomena should class?  
Whether 'twere best opine Christ was,  
Or never was at all, or whether  
He was, and was not,—both together,  
It matters little for the name,  
So the idea be left the same."

† See "Angelic Wisdom concerning the Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom," No. 4.

‡ Ditto, No. 14.

|| Ditto, No. 15.

is, that it may be anything; thus, and not otherwise, He is the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last, and the Alpha and Omega. It cannot be said that His *Esse* is from itself, because this *from itself* supposes what is prior, and thus time, which is not applicable to the Infinite which is called "*from Eternity*." . . . "That God is not only *Esse* in itself, but also *Existere* in itself, is because an *esse*, unless it exists, it not anything; and in like manner, an *existere*, unless it be from an *esse*; wherefore, one being given, the other is given: in like manner, a substance is not anything, unless it be also a form; of a substance, unless it be a form, nothing can be predicated; and this, because it has no quality, is in itself, nothing. The reason why we here say *Esse* and *Existere*, and not *Essence* and *Existence*, is because a distinction is to be observed between *Esse* and *Essence*, and thence between *Existere* and *Existence*, as between what is prior and what is posterior; and what is prior is more universal than what is posterior. Infinity and eternity are applicable to the Divine *Esse*; but to the Divine *Essence* and *Existence*, Divine Love and Divine Wisdom are applicable." And this application of Love and Wisdom to the Divine *Existence* Rothe does make. With Swedenborg, he calls them will and understanding, and says that in their union they constitute the divine existence. With Swedenborg, further, he holds that the Divine Will is the primary and essential principle entering into the Divine Being, and that this is a fact which cannot be too strongly emphasized. Almost using Swedenborg's terminology, he adds further, that love and will on the one hand, and wisdom and understanding on the other, realize themselves, respectively, as absolute rationality and absolute freedom.

The entire article might well be devoted to a further development of this subject, but we must proceed to something else.

#### THE TRINITY.

Both writers teach a Divine Trinity, but both expressly reject the doctrine of the Church on the subject. They find the latter

nowhere in the Scriptures, they see no religious necessity for it, and have no place for it in their systems, which are rooted in, hang together by, and are intelligible only under the light of the truth of the unity of God. Swedenborg goes so far as to say that many souls are in Hell on account of the doctrine, and ascribes to it, as their pestiferous fountain, the great mass of the ruinous errors which for more than ten centuries have infected the Christian Church. But in the writings of no theologian do we find our Saviour exalted higher. He is Jehovah God, the Alpha and the Omega, and He alone. So the Scriptures everywhere teach, and it is diabolical madness to say anything else. To go back of Him in thought is to indulge in mere abstractions, and to go back of Him in devotion or worship is an utter impossibility, which every sane man must feel every time he tries, and every honest man will confess when called upon. The Scriptures speak of Father, Son and Holy Ghost; these are not three persons, but they are Divine forms or actualities, at hand in Him, who is one person and no more. In praying, you may say, "Thou," in using either of the above Divine names, but you must know that you are to go alone to Christ the Lord, and this is the only way to save your soul.

At a certain juncture in the development of Rothe's system three concepts are evolved which correspond to what he calls "modes" of the divine existence. In an episodical observation he speaks trenchantly regarding them as follows: "One who likes to play hide-and-go-seek might have a fine opportunity here to offer the just unfolded concept of God as a trinitarian one. Apart from such conceived violence, this concept might boast of being that of the triune God; for there is really in it, what in the Church doctrine is not the case, but only pretended, namely, a real trine and a real unity in God. For throughout it is *the same* (being) *who* exists, and throughout it is *something else*, which this same (being) is. And this other is not merely another *name*, under which something specifically, other (than itself) can really be thought of, as is the case with the church-doctrine of the Trinity, to which (as all three hypos-

tases are to be persons) one is compelled to attach a tritheistic thought, or is unable to attach any thought at all. . . . As said above, we would have little trouble in appearing to have speculatively constructed the orthodox trinitarian doctrine, or at least the triune concept of God. But we mention this expressly to guard against such a misunderstanding. We state distinctly that the concept of God, here presented, wants nor means to be the trinity-concept taught by the Church, nor a trinitarian concept in any sense at all. We cannot find any call for bringing forward a trinitarian concept of God; especially from our *Christian* (italics his) Faith arises for us no such call in any shape or form."\*

#### THE ANGELS.

Should we take up the topics of Creation and Anthropology, and enter fully into the points of agreement in our authors' views, a volume would be required. But the subject of the Angels must detain us here. The view generally held by the theologians is that these constitute a separate order of beings, in no necessary way linked with humanity. They are originally created spiritual beings, destined to continue a uniform exalted existence to all eternity, executing the divine purpose in the boundless universe in a form and manner almost entirely unknown to mortals. Now and then, but in rather a sporadic way, they are utilized in the economy of redemption; but for the most part are thought of as standing off in inexpressible admiration of the divine condescension in the incarnation and the wisdom of the scheme for which it prepares the way, as though, according to the comparison made in this REVIEW some ten years ago, and certainly not yet forgotten, it was the grand Corliss engine setting the complicated machinery-hall of the kingdom of grace in motion.

But the comprehensive genius, either of Rothe or Swedenborg, could not admit what seemed to them such a loose or disjointed scheme of the universe as this theory presupposes.

\* Ethik 37, Ann. 1,' Aufg. 2.

From the days of Humboldt the tendency of physical science has consciously moved in the direction of establishing the organic unity of the material creation in such form that each part stands in the relation of mutual dependence upon and support to the others. Scientists hold that we are to take cognizance of no being or order of beings outside of the empirical or so-called *natural* domain. But in Rothe's thinking there are necessarily evolved concepts of beings belonging to a sphere beyond the reach of our organs of sense; and every one who has the least acquaintance with Swedenborg's doctrine knows how important a part it assigns angels, from beginning to end. These men are virtually unique in the comprehensiveness of their theoretical grasp of the Macrocosm, including the spiritual world, and Rothe seems to think that they are *absolutely* so. In the five solid volumes of his *Ethik*, he mentions the name of Swedenborg but once.\* In § 448, Band II, Amm. 2, Ausg. 2, he observes, "The perfected human individuals (*Einzelwesen*) as pure spirits are angels. As is well known, it is one of Swedenborg's ground thoughts that man becomes an angel." They agree as to the origin (perhaps a better word would be the genesis) of the angels (taken in the widest sense), as to their direct influence upon man, and as to their entering into a universally comprehensive and vitally connected organism of intelligences.

The Angelic world is throughout peopled from below. This, as we have already seen, may be called the end of creation. Multitudes of the countless material spheres, like our earth, are inhabited by what Swedenborg calls human beings, and probably had been so inhabited before what is generally meant by the creation of the world. These all originally had material bodies, but having passed through a process of spiritualization (which, according to Rothe, is always an ethical one), laid these aside and entered the world of spirits. Here they form classes under corresponding heads, to which, among other functions,

\* If we are in error in making this statement we would be most thankfully corrected. His name occurs in both editions, once in each.

this prominent one is assigned, of helping beings still in the flesh to accomplish the great moral task of raising the material into the realm of the spiritual, and thus carrying forward the divine purpose of creation towards its ultimate goal.\* Thus room is made for the universal significance of the incarnation. The eternal Son was made flesh that He might be raised above and made Head over all things. In this connection, Rothe refers to the *πρωτόκος πάσης κτίσεως* of Col. 1 : 15, who is before all things and by Him all things consists,—all things “that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers.” A similar thought is that of the *ανακεφαλαιώσις* of Eph. 1 : 10, the recapitulation or summing up in Christ of all things, “both which are in heaven and which are on earth.” Thus all these really spiritualized beings move onward by a sort of asymptotic process toward the realization of the idea of their nature, or purpose of their creation, in proportion, both to their growing receptivity for the divine fullness of Him that filleth all in all, or to the measure of their efficiency in co-operating with the divine purpose aimed at in the creation and redemption of the world.

THE UNION OF THE HUMAN AND DIVINE IN THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

Rothe holds a view on this subject which is very different from the one generally prevailing, but finds himself supported by many of the leading theologians of Germany, notably by Dorner, who perhaps gave more laborious attention to the doctrine of the person of Christ than any other writer. The union was not complete in the beginning, but went regularly and

\* “Der Entwicklungs-process, der Menschheit, wie es einerseits durch die Vermittelung der schon vollendeten Geisterwelt von Gott vollzogen worden ist, ist eben so andererseits ein Process der organischen Zusammewachsens jener mit dieser gewesen.” *Ethik*, § 454, Ausg. 2. In § 50 he says, “All the particular world-spheres stand in absolute continuity and mutual subordination, and form themselves organically into a unified world-whole, into one great *Gesammt-organismus der Geisterwelten oder Himmel*.”

uninterruptedly forward, until it found its completion in Christ's death on the cross. They emphasize the statement of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews that the Captain of our salvation was made perfect through suffering. Rothe lays stress upon the fact that He sustained assaults from infernal agencies to a degree far beyond all human conception. His conflicts with the powers of darkness were engaged in continuously, having their visible counterpart in the murderous schemes of the Jewish authorities, until the hour of His expiration on the cross, when their apparent conquest was His glorious victory, which found its consummation in what is expressed by the words, "He destroyed Him that had the power over death, which is the devil," and in the language of the *Te Deum* as follows: "When Thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death, Thou didst open the kingdom of heaven to all believers." Views closely akin to Rothe's on this subject are now so profusely spread out before the English-reading theological public in the vast mass of German writers introduced to us in our vernacular, that nothing more need be said in regard to them. Only this remark must be made: that the process in the life of the Master was archetypal in its character, and is repeated, only in a lower form, in the unfolding of the divine principle, which is the life-work of each one of His servants.

Now attend to a few, out of multitudes to the same purport, of the statements of Swedenborg on this point. "That the union was effected by the acts of redemption, is because the Lord performed them from His Human; and as he operated, so the Divine, which is meant by the Father, came nearer, assisted, and co-operated, and at length they so conjoined themselves, that they were not two, but one, and this union is glorification."\*

"In like manner the Lord united Himself to His Father, and the Father united Himself to Him; in a word, the Lord glorified His Human, that is, made it divine in the same manner in which He regenerates man, that is makes him spiritual."†

\* True Christian Religion, No. 97.

† True Christian Religion, No. 106.



Redemption "was battles with the hells, subjugation of them. . . . But glorification is the union of the Human of the Lord with the divine of His Father. This was done successively, and was fully completed by the passion of the cross; for every man ought, on his part, to approach to God, and in proportion as man approaches, God on His part enters. . . . Wherefore, when any one conquers in temptation he is most intimately conjoined with God; and the Lord then was most intimately united to God His Father."\*

#### FORMATION OF THE SPIRITUAL BODY.

Rothe has a peculiar theory in regard to an inner organism evolved from man's material nature, which he forms for himself in the unfolding of the moral process, and it is with this, according to 2 Cor. v. 1-5, that he clothes himself here, so that he may not be found naked hereafter. Dorner, in his *Ethik*, page 267, describes and criticises it as follows: "Rothe more rigidly than Schleiermacher insists upon the spiritualization of nature as the moral task. He regards it as the aim of creation (*Weltzweck*). The spirit, according to him, is the union and permeation of the ideal and real. It takes place in virtue of the moral process. This latter consists in the generating of what is spiritual out of what is material. The design of matter is that those elements capable of it become spirit, and the design of the personality is that it become spirit through the appropriation of matter. Through the moral process a spiritual body is formed, and this is the task or the design of the moral process. But this formation, as it is something we are not conscious of, could only be the self-resultant effect of the moral process, and should not be so layed down as the proper (*eigentliche*) moral task of the man, but simply as God's arrangement (*ordnung*) and deed."

Swedenborg speaks as follows: "Love and will is the very soul of a deed or work, forming its body in the sincere and just actions which a man performs. The spiritual body, or the

\* Ditto, No. 126.

body of a man's spirit, is from no other origin; that is, it is formed from nothing else but the things which a man does from his love or will."\*

"Every man after death, puts off the natural, which he had from the mother, and retains the spiritual, which he had from the father, together with a kind of border from the purest things of nature around it."†

Once more. When man's natural body "is laid aside, his soul comes clothed with a spiritual body into a world where all things are spiritual, and is there associated with his like. Now since the spiritual body must be formed in the material body, and is formed by means of truth and goods which flow in from the Lord through the spiritual world, and which are received by man inwardly in such things in him as are from the natural world, which are called civil and moral, the character of the formation which takes place is manifest."‡

Rothe calls the spiritual organism the man's property (*Eigenthum*), in the most real sense of the word, to the conscious possession of which he comes when "the earthly tabernacle is dissolved." With this he enters the spiritual world and thus rises from the dead. In this view Swedenborg agrees with him, both denying the teaching of the church regarding the resurrection of the body to take place at the last day. §

#### THE HISTORICAL CHURCH.

The two writers agree in considering the historical church as the inadequate bearer of the Christian life, as having in the past served a divinely appointed purpose, but at present, as a *church*, utterly incompetent to meet the spiritual necessities of the race, and as being but a transitory or provisional form of Christianity destined to dissolution and to displacement by a redemptive arrangement or institution specifically different

\* Heaven and Hell, No. 475.

† True Christian Religion, No. 103.

‡ True Christian Religion, No. 583.

from it, and more commensurate with the purpose and teaching of our Saviour regarding His Kingdom on the earth. Rothe's view of the Redeemer's work of the salvation of the world is nothing if not historical. The laws of evolution can find no truer illustration than in his method of showing how the divine principle of life, implanted in the incarnation, works forward like leaven "until the whole lump is leavened." Nothing could be more cheerful than his optimism. There is profound truth in chiliasm, which Christianity never has been nor never will be able to renounce. What Agnostic philosophers can promise themselves on the basis of purely materialistic principles and natural laws, regarding the more than Utopian outcome of the ethical progress of mankind, he can, with far more certain confidence, hope for on the ground of the promises of the gospel. He believes that the time will come when not only "every knee shall bow and tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord," but when every form of science and philosophy will find itself clear, self-consistent and true, in so far as it is illumined and confirmed by the doctrine of the Cross. But, be it understood, this consummation is to be brought about by forces now at hand and working slowly, it is true, but because the church, rooted in the incarnation, and united with her risen Lord, is supported in no *unnatural* way by constantly renewed impartations, mediated by the means of grace on the one hand and angelic ministrations on the other, flowing down from the glorified Head of the church, whose intercessory work consists chiefly in this: that He proves Himself the ever-living fountain of grace and truth,—slowly, he says, nevertheless irresistibly, towards its accomplishment. When our Lord predicts phenomena connected with His second coming, which indicate a supernatural catastrophe, He refers to purely material occurrences which are not vitally connected with historical process of the work of redemption.

Swedenborg says: "That four churches in general have existed on this earth from the beginning—one before the flood, another after it, the Israelitish church the third, and that called

Christian fourth,—was shown above, . . . and as all the churches have not been in that truth, it follows that a church is to succeed the four. . . . This New Church is the crown of all the churches that have hitherto existed on the earth.”\* This is the Church of the New Jerusalem, which comes into existence in Christ’s second Advent. “This Second Coming of the Lord takes place by means of a man, before whom He has manifested Himself in person.”

#### THE STATE OF BLESSEDNESS.

Swedenborg holds that in the future world we will meet our departed loved ones, and continue our intercourse with them as long as, according to the character we formed on earth, we find it desirable so to do. He says spirits seek and meet one another as they are mutually prompted by their loves; and these will hereafter be similar to what they are here. Rothe maintains that there can be no personal identity which does not involve memory. Much, of course, will be forgotten and, of needs, must be. But that certainly must be retained which was vitally connected with that ethical process which terminates in the state of the blessed.

Both reject the idea not only of mere repose, but that also of exclusive contemplation and worship. There is constant activity in the future world, aiming at definite results.

Both hold to continuous advance in perfection in efficiency, knowledge and bliss. If any asks why believers are said to be perfected (*vollendet*) at death, Rothe answers, “Each one receives that measure of bliss which he is able to accept. The measure of receptivity for it is different in the case of each, but in the case of each it is fully satisfied.” What the Psalmist promises himself goes into literal fulfillment: “I shall be satisfied when I awake in Thy likeness.” And this satisfaction must increase in proportion as we grow more and more like the Lord.

\* True Christian Religion, No. 786. True Christian Religion, caption of chapter beginning with 779.

Verily these men mused, and as they did so the fire burned. Whether it was a strange fire or not, a disciple of Swedenborg would say, will appear when we learn more about the "things which must be hereafter," when the door opened in Heaven becomes more widely and invitingly open, and when we shall listen with more obedient ears, to the voice which, as a trumpet talking with us, says "Come up higher."

But this much is certain, that these great men teach the church of the present day an important lesson, which it were well for it to take deeply to heart. It is this: with more intensity of thought and will to heed three great facts which it professes in common with them to believe, namely:

I. In the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments we have a revelation of God. The Bible, accordingly, is the proper object of the Christian's devout, reverential and faithful study. Let any who wishes to know what Rothe thinks of the matter, read what he has to say in the third part of *Ethik*, namely, the *Pflichtenlehre*, where he inculcates the duty, not only of reading God's word as a private devotional exercise in connection with meditation and prayer, but of methodical investigation with a view to that illumination which is so essential an element of the Christian life. He classes his exhaustive and frightfully searching criticism, amounting almost to a dissection of the doctrine of the Inspiration of the Scriptures, by assuring his readers that whatever may be his theoretical conclusions on the subject, he expresses the sincerest and profoundest conviction of his heart when he lays his hand on the Bible and says: "For me this is the house of God and the gate of Heaven."

Emerson animadverts upon the great Swede, as follows: "The vice of Swedenborg's mind is its theologic determination. Nothing with him has the liberality of universal wisdom, but we are always in a church. That Hebrew muse, which taught the lore of right and wrong to men, had the same excess of influence for him it has had for the nations. The mode, as well as the essence, was sacred. Palestine is ever the more valuable as a chapter in universal history, and ever the less an

available element in education. The genius of Swedenborg, largest of all modern souls in this department of thought, wasted itself in the endeavor to reanimate and conserve what had already arrived at its natural term, and, in the great secular Providence, was retiring from its prominence before western modes of thought and expression." The people of this Land are not yet so entirely given over to "Western modes of thought and expression" as to be inclined to lay the Bible on the shelf as an antiquated and outlandish book. "The Hebrew muse still exerts its influence in teaching the lore of right and wrong to men," but by no means "to excess," and Palestine is still regarded as "an available element in education." This is likely to continue to be the case as long as men can be found who believe the system of truth represented by the Bible to be as comprehensive, self-consistent and adapted to the needs of mankind as is any system of modern philosophy, whether materialistic or transcendental, especially if, instead of this Hebrew Muse's lore of right and wrong, it substitutes the doctrines that we should repose faith in no one but ourselves, that we need not pray, that the less we have to do with our sins the better and "No man can afford to waste his moments in compunctions"\* It is apparent from Emerson's unbounded admiration for the many excellent qualities in the writings of Swedenborg, that he has infinitely more respect for them than for those of a thinker like Herbert Spencer; whilst the latter would turn up the lip of scorn at an expression like this: "It is remarkable that this sublime genius decides peremptorily for the analytic against the synthetic method; and in a book, *The Animal Kingdom*, whose genius is a daring poetic synthesis, claims to confine himself to a rigid † experience," and would add that it is not to be

\* See Emerson's *Essay on Swedenborg*.

† See Emerson on Swedenborg. Here may be pointedly called to mind the following lines from the poet already repeatedly quoted, and in whom so much is to be found reminding us of the subjects of our article:

"I say the acknowledgment of God in Christ  
Accepted by thy reason solves for thee,

wondered at that Emerson's and Swedenborg's theories have been confounded with each other, because, in so many respects coincident, they differ chiefly in this: that that of the latter, whilst it is at once more far-reaching and logically harmonious, revolves around a personal Being as its centre, whilst that of the former assumes an impersonal absolute, which, as Rothe says, is no proper object either of love or respect. The lore of the Bible vanquished heathenism of old, and, for some time, at least, it is likely to hold its own against that of modern times.

II. There is a spiritual world around us with which we stand in close, constant and vital contact. This fact is fully recognized in the hymns, the prayers and the confessions of the church, and is pre-supposed and referred to in the Bible from beginning to end. Who has ever given special attention to the teaching of the Scriptures on the subject who has not been impressed by the fact that here is presented a subject worthy of careful study? If the Scriptures and the church up to this day teach the truth in regard to the angelic world, who is prepared to say that at the present time it receives the consideration it deserves? The *Zeitgeist* shows impatience at the very mention of the theme. A theologian like Bernard Weiss levels down to the plane of the baldest naturalism all the Scriptural data on the subject, in so far as it bears upon the life of Christ, or is borne upon by it. The tendency seems to be to reduce all to a sort of Christian mythology, or to a poetical machinery,

All questions in the earth and out of it  
And has so far advanced thee to be wise.  
Wouldst thou unprove this, to re-prove the proved?  
In life's mere minute, with power to use that proof?  
Thou hast it; use it, and forthwith, or die!  
*For I say this is death and the sole death*  
When a man's loss comes to him from his gain,  
Darkness from light, from knowledge ignorance.  
And lack of love from love made manifest;  
A lamp's death, when replete with oil it chokes;  
A stomach's, when surcharged with food, it starves."

BROWNING'S "A Death in the Desert."



which in our religious teaching cannot, with convenience, be entirely dispensed with.

Emerson is scandalized at finding devils in Swedenborg's system. "His pernicious theologic limitation amounts to a painful perversion of truth," "the extreme proportion of unbelief," "the last profanation," when the great mystic denies "conversion for evil spirits." When he bases his condemnation of this tenet on the assertion that "Everything is superficial, and perishes, but love and truth only," he has Rothe coinciding with him; for he says that the absolute will and understanding are the constitutive elements of the divine personality. This must take up into itself all, that in the way of creation has gone out from itself, in living union with itself. What cannot be thus taken up must ultimately perish. Still Rothe is liable, with Swedenborg, to the stigma put upon the class by Emerson of the "vindictive theologian," to whose theology the wild humor of Burns is preferable, who, in his apostrophe to poor Mickie Ben, says: "O wad ye take a thought and mend."

Rothe and Swedenborg, in a most impressive way, remind Christians that bound up with their faith, and of most momentous significance for their moral and religious life here, as well as for their weal or woe hereafter, is the doctrine, that there is a spiritual world around us consisting of Heaven and Hell, and that these antagonistic realms press down upon us, with all their supernatural power, every moment of our lives, and at every point of our being. They hold that the infinitely greatest portion of God's created universe is comprehended in this spiritual kingdom, to which all that is material sustains the relation of the extremities or outskirts. These earnest men call upon us to do one of two things: either to cast aside the doctrine, and avoid even rhetorical allusions to it, or allow it, in all its tremendous import, to confront our most serious thought and to receive our humble submission, together with all that this logically involves. If there is any weakness connected with accepting the truth, it is plain that this weakness is the condemnation of those who stand midway between faith and unbelief, and are

either unable or unwilling to bring themselves to a clear consciousness of what they hold and where they stand.\*

III. The central significance of the incarnate and glorified Lord as the determining and regulative power of all proper Christian thought and life. We think that the two authors we are comparing would say that the gist of their systems could hardly be better given in a few words than in the language of the Apostle: "Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all Heavens, that He might fill all things." "What think ye of Christ?" as has so often been said in the pages of this REVIEW, is the burning question of the hour. Rothe and Swedenborg would say that to answer it properly you must direct the eye of your faith to where, as the risen Lord, He now lives and reigns as Head over all things to His body, which is the church, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all, and remember that this church includes not only the redeemed of this world, but of all worlds. The Apostle in Patmos saw Him in His celestial glory and heard him say: "I am the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." Does our faith accept this as the only proper answer to the momentous question? For how many, on the contrary, who profess faith in Christ is the apocalyptic vision a mere phantom, and the blessed reality

\* Since writing the above we were pleased to find the following from the pen of Mr. Starbuck, in the November number of the *Andover Review*: "But here, as in various other points, the theories of Protestantism are defensively negative to the point of weakness. It has a far greater body of filial confidence in God as a Father than Catholicism. But this is too precisely shut in. Protestantism is so manifestly zealous against superstition that it has often wounded faith. But now things are evidently working together for an epoch in which the present Christendom is to be related to the world as the Israel of Christ's day was related to the present Christendom. Another creative epoch is impending. Under the mantle of despair stir the obscure beginnings of a great hope.

"And kings sit still with awful eye

As if they surely knew their Sovereign Lord was by."

little more than a gnostic dream ! Could we by the eye of faith see, however dim the perception might be, if the faith were but properly poised, what the inspired seer beheld, and from this point of view allow our theological opinions to arrange themselves and our Christian aim and activities regulate themselves, the result would certainly be a great modification of doctrine and life in the direction of a more truthful and harmonious unity of believers. Well for the future of the church if our Timothys throughout the world would appropriate the instruction coming from the pen of the great Apostle, in its entire fullness and force : " And without controversy great is the mystery of Godliness ; God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."—1 Timothy, 3-16.

## II.

### THE SPECIFIC CHARACTER OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

(Translated from the German of Dr. Christian Ernest Luthardt.)

BY REV. CHARLES C. STARBUCK.

*Friends and brothers :—*

The theme, touching which I propose addressing you—The Specific Character of the Four Gospels—conducts us out of the conflicts of our own time into the first ages of Christianity and of the Christian literature. May the remembrance of those days be as a salutation of peace in the midst of the struggles of parties in our own days!

Whatever may be our relation to the Christian faith and to the accredited doctrines of the Christian Church, it is nevertheless acknowledged by all, that the person of Jesus Christ is the central point of that faith, and the confession of Him the central point of that doctrine. And even if any one regards the annals of mankind merely with the interest of an historian of culture and not with that of a religious man or of a Christian, he must acknowledge that the form of Jesus Christ towers by more than one head above all the other great ones of history, and, brief as was its course on earth, has left behind ineffaceable traces of its presence not merely in the outer form of the world, but in the inmost life of mankind and in the hearts of millions. Even on this ground, those writings which constitute the most ancient accounts of that wonderful manifestation cannot fail to arouse a lively interest. But to us, who in Jesus adoringly acknowledge the Saviour of our souls, the evangelical accounts of Him are the sanctuary of our faith. And

among all the Sacred Scriptures of our religion, we hazard nothing in saying that the Gospels have always been to the congregation of believers the dearest and most intimately familiar. This, therefore, may well give occasion to the wish to gain a just understanding of them, not only in general, but also as they are specifically distinguished from each other.

It is a double impression which we all receive when we read the evangelical narratives. On the one hand, the impression of agreement. It is the same life which is here portrayed to us, equally wonderful and of equal power to move and subdue the heart in all. It is oftentimes the same occurrences which are reported to us, and not seldom the evangelists agree even in terms, just as if the one of them had had the others before him as he wrote. And manifoldly various as is the material which they present to us, it nevertheless rounds itself into a common image and a combined effect. It is a thoroughly definite image of the personality of Jesus Christ that stands before the soul of us all; and this image is the result of the evangelical narratives. The impression which they make is that of agreement.

Yet, on the other hand, they give the impression of difference. It is not merely that they contain different materials. Even the image of Jesus appears to us different. Let us only place the image of superhuman majesty and divinity which John's gospel sets before our eyes by the side of that one so much plainer and more human which the first three evangelists depict, and now, as has always been true, we find that this difference makes upon every one an irresistible impression. But among the first three also the differences are such as cannot be slighted. We have only to compare together the way in which Matthew and Luke respectively set forth their common subject.

Now how are we to explain this union of agreement on the one hand and difference on the other? Does the distinction consist only in that difference in the form of the narrative which is always inevitable and involuntary where two indepen-

dent narrators relate the same history? Let the account of historical occurrences be ever so faithful, impartial and void of ulterior reference, it is of necessity subject to this cause of variation. To the same necessity the evangelical historians were also subject. The state of the case may be explained in this way, without undertaking to inquire for any deeper ground. But this explanation does not suffice.

Have the evangelists only desired to relate the history as men relate other histories? Have they kept and bequeathed to us journals of the life of Jesus? Or has their purpose been to give us biographies of Jesus, without conjoining with them any wider references? Was their purpose only an historical one? In that case their attention would have been chiefly directed to the securing of exactness and completeness in the narrative. But this is not the case and the differences are then inexplicable. Let me illustrate this by an example. You all know the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew. Compare it with the parallel passage in Luke—how different it is! For one thing, how it differs in length. In Matthew it occupies three chapters; \* in Luke, not even one.† Then, note the difference of subject-matter. Whole divisions of the discourse as it is found in Matthew, and those extensive and momentous ones, are lacking in Luke, above all, the entire section respecting the contrast between the Christian righteousness and fulfillment of the law and the pharisaic. Luke, on the other hand, has certain utterances, such as the woes against the rich and full, which Matthew has not. Is it perchance an entirely different discourse which Luke reports? This way of evading difficulties in the gospels has been no unusual one, it being presupposed that the evangelists were, above everything, intent on precision and completeness in their narratives. But here no such explanation is possible. The occasion of the discourse and the circumstances under which it was delivered, its beginning and conclusion and its fundamental thought, are the same in Luke as in Matthew. It is unques-

\* Chaps. V.-VII.

† VI: 20-49.

tionably the same discourse. Shall we say with Schleiermacher, that the auditor who reported the Sermon to Luke appears to have had a bad place for hearing, so that a good deal of it escaped him? But why did not Luke have recourse to a better authority? He had doubtless spent a considerable time in Palestine gathering materials for his gospel, and assuredly the Sermon on the Mount was not unfamiliar to the primitive Church. How, then, are we to explain the difference? This is only one example of many. The problem becomes yet more intricate when we compare the first three gospels with the fourth. The first three set forth Jesus' ministry in Galilee; the fourth gospel gives account of a ministry of Jesus in Judea anterior to that in Galilee, and as it proceeds, we find it to be Jesus' journeys to the feasts at Jerusalem on which the course of its narrative depends. Did the first three evangelists know nothing of these? That is hard to suppose. But if they did know of them, why are they silent about them, so that the history of Jesus' ministry assumes in them so wholly different a form? We know in John, how significant a part is played by the raising of Lazarus, and how decisive of the fate of Christ. The first three evangelists say nothing about it. Was it unknown to them? Why do they pass over in silence Christ's sojourning in Bethany before His entry into Jerusalem, as they also pass over in silence His presence at the wedding in Cana before His public appearance? And of questions like these, many may be proposed.

On the assumption above-named, the dilemma appears to be unavoidable that only one of the two accounts can be accurate, either that of the first three evangelists or that of John. Which now is in the right?

In the school of Schleiermacher the answer was, John. And our own inner persuasion willingly bends this way. From of old it is just this gospel which men have placed above the others, because such a breathing of eternity is diffused over it, and the deep and mysterious words which we listen to therein mightily move our souls.



But if once we make such a distinction, can we not just as well give the preference to the first three gospels? And it was natural that such a reaction should set in. If only one of the narratives is historical—so objected a school proceeding from Tübingen—and the other unhistorical, we ought rather to ascribe the praise of historical worth to that narrative which, in its manner of representation, is naïver, less precommitted to a theory, less aiming at a particular end, and, in its plan, less artificially disposed; and on the other hand, we ought to be mistrustful towards that narrative which is evidently controlled by premeditated purpose and deliberate tendency. And this is evidently the case in the gospel of John. The evangelical narratives are related to each other very much as are the representations of the teaching of Socrates. We have an account of him from his scholar Xenophon, who, in unartificial naïveté, brings him before us in a series of separate scenes, showing us how he enters into converse with the most different sorts of people in the market and in the workshops, in order, beginning with the nearest questions of daily life, to conduct and incite them to deeper meditation upon the moral questions and duties of human existence. Wholly different is the form of Socrates as it appears to us in the Platonic dialogues. In these the scholar has evidently more or less put his own speculations into the mouth of his honored teacher. Even so it is with John's gospel. It is controlled by a definite tendency. Therefore it is unhistorical. This was the language of that school, which acknowledged the eminent scholar Christian Baur as its head.

But how if it could be shown that the first three gospels also are not in such a degree naïve collections of individual narrations or anecdotes, as they were taken for in Schleiermacher's school, but that here, too, the historical delineation is controlled by a definite fundamental thought, and placed under the light of a definite point of view? And this is the fact. Does it then follow from this, that they are unhistorical? And if this conclusion does not follow in the case of these, then the

conclusion will perhaps appear unwarranted in the case of the fourth gospel.

A great history may be presented under different points of view. The representation will, in consequence of this, turn out very different, while yet it will remain historical and true, provided that the points of view, under which it has been placed, are derived from the history itself. Let us suppose a delineation of the life of Napoleon I. How differently may this life be viewed! One writer, in treating it, may wish to bring into view the great military genius; another, the great organizer. Or perhaps it is moral ideas that are to be shown forth; how the destruction of the historical foundations of society by revolution ends, with inner necessity, in military dominion, or in Cæsarism, or how God sometimes sends upon forms of life that are outworn a Scourge of God, to procure room for the constitution of a new state of things, or how pride comes before a fall, or whatever else may be the point of view. Each will involve a widely different presentation of the history, a different selection and grouping of the material, a different emphasizing of the facts. And yet it remains the same history. But what is the life of a Napoleon compared with the life of Jesus Christ—a life in whose overflowing wealth the greatest antitheses that are conceivable meet and join together?

And to this reason is to be added another. We have here not merely to consider how a history may be presented in various points of view. The history is only a medium for the doctrine. The design of the evangelist is not to relate the history, but to proclaim the salvation that has appeared on earth in the person and history of Jesus Christ, to bring into view the eternal thoughts of God that here have entered time, to teach the way by which we are to arrive at the salvation of our souls. To this design the history is only subservient. What John writes at the conclusion of his gospel: "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name,"—this is true of all the gospels. And according to the

occasion, and the need which faith might find before it from time to time, the instruction also, which was intended to supply that need, must assume a different form. We know that the doctrinal instruction of the early Christian Church consisted, above all, in the communication of the evangelical history, of the life and words of Jesus. The doctrinal instruction was essentially of an historical kind, but the history had a doctrinal tendency. And as the circumstances of time and place required this or that special form of doctrinal instruction, the proclamation of the gospel took also a different form. From this point of view are we to understand our gospels. Selection, arrangement, mode of presentation, are defined even into details by the special didactic purpose which they had. And this itself is determined by the historical circumstances. Let us then, with this in mind, consider the several gospels.

The Church of Jesus had its first seat in *Israel*. Here, as we see from the Acts, great multitudes had been converted to faith in Jesus the Christ. So much the more was their new faith and the confession of it exposed to severe assaults and hostile plottings on the part of their gainsaying Jewish countrymen. These attacks made necessary a special form of instruction, such as was adapted to serve the purpose of strengthening and securing the faith of just such Christians. This form of the evangelical message is represented by the Gospel of Matthew.

The ancient ecclesiastical tradition relates that Matthew, after having preached the gospel orally to his countrymen, thought good, before leaving the land, to bequeath to them the substance of his preaching in written form, and moreover, adds the tradition, in the vernacular tongue, so that here the words of the Lord were preserved in the same language in which they had been spoken. This fragment of information raises a series of questions, as to the answer of which learned inquiry is not of one mind; as for instance, how our Greek Matthew is related to that Hebrew one, and whether the present extended form of the gospel is identical with the original work of the Apostle, etc.

Respecting these questions two opinions are possible; two things, however, are certain: first, that our Gospel of Matthew goes back in essentials, to the Apostle Matthew. Of this we have an intimation in the work itself. There, where the evangelist gives a representation of the miraculous activity of Jesus in Galilee, he chooses out of Jesus' prophet-life in Galilee one day, which comprises the calling of Matthew from the receipt of custom in Capernaum to be a follower of Christ.\* It is natural, that this decisive day of his life should lie nearest his heart, and move him to use it as an example of the ministry of Jesus in Galilee at large. Here, then, we can plainly enough recognize the hand of the reporter. The other point which is indisputable is this: that the gospel, as it lies before us, forms a true and perfect unity governed by one fundamental thought, consecutively conceived and written and symmetrically arranged. In Israel, the symbolism of numbers was thoroughly naturalized. We see this often in the Old Testament Scriptures, especially in the Psalms. And in Matthew's Gospel also, it cannot be overlooked. It is the Heptad which pervades this gospel. Seven great discourses of Jesus does it contain;† into seven parts, if I have the right view, does it divide.‡ The genealogy at the beginning, divides into three groups of twice seven generations each; in the Sermon on the Mount seven Beatitudes with a threefold conclusion begin the public teaching of Christ; the seven Woes upon the Scribes and Pharisees conclude His public teaching, and in the midst we read the seven Parables of the Kingdom. We see it is one hand which meets us in this gospel; it is not in the way of accident and gradual accumulation of material that it has arisen.

\* Chap. IX: 9, f. cf. the proof of this *Zeitschr. f. Protest. u. Kirche* 1851. Dec. S. 331 ff. Lichtenstein, *Lebensgesch. Jesu Christi* S. 213.

† Chap. V—VII. Chap. X. Chap. XIII. Chap. XVIII. Chap. XXI: 23—XXII: 14. Chap. XXIII. Chap. XXIV—XXV.

‡ Chap. I, II. Chap. III—IV: 11. Chap. IV: 12—IX: 35. Chap. IX: 36—XIII: 53. Chap. XIII: 54—XX: 16. Chap. XX: 17—XXV. Chap. XXVI—XXVIII.

What thought now lies at the foundation of this gospel? For Jewish Christians of the Holy Land was it written, for the strengthening and assurance of their faith. We have intimations enough, from which we can form to ourselves an image of the difficult position in which the Christian Jews found themselves, over against their unbelieving countrymen. They were obliged to submit to the severest accusations which could be preferred against a devout Jew. They were upbraided as apostates from the people of God and from the Old Testament Revelation; the faith in Jesus of Nazareth, the Crucified, they were told, was a contradiction to the Messianic prophecies, their doctrine and life a falling-away from the Holy Law; they had, it was declared, ceased to be members of the congregation of Jehovah, and had no part in the blessing of Abraham and in the future kingdom of the King, the Son of David. Hath any one of the rulers or of the learned of the people believed on him? It is among the ignorant people of Galilee that the deceiver has gathered his sect of apostates. Such was the tenor of the accusations, which the gainsaying Jews advanced against the believers out of Israel. Now we must bring before our minds those Israelites' whole world of thought and feeling, must consider what was, to their minds, bound up in the law of Moses and the predictions of the prophets, and citizenship among the people of God, if we would understand the internal conflicts into which many earnest souls might be thrown by such accusations. When now, under such circumstances, an apostle proclaimed the Gospel of Jesus Christ, he could not content himself with the simple narration of the history, as if all were peace, and there were no conflicts of soul; but, necessarily and naturally, the gospel could not fail to assume an apologetic form and tenor. And so, also, does the Gospel of Matthew appear to us. It is a great apology of the Christian faith over against the reproaches of the Jews. It is a narration and representation of the life of Jesus, but throughout from the apologetic point of view.

None of you, doubtless, needs to be reminded how often in

this gospel the phrase occurs: "This all came to pass, that it might be fulfilled." The evangelical history—this is its thought—is not the falling-away from the holy history and Scripture of Israel, but the fulfillment of the same; the Christian faith stands not in conflict but in agreement with the Old Testament Scriptures. It is not merely that isolated passages of the Old Testament are fulfilled—that is not its meaning; in the particular passages is only set forth how the Old Testament history and Scripture in general stand related to the New Testament Revelation. Not only individual words of prophecy, but the entire Old Testament history and Scripture have found their fulfillment in Jesus Christ, and the Old Testament Church of God in that of the New Testament.

The very first words show this. "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham,"—so does it begin. Abraham is the starting-point of the history of Israel, David its Old Testament culmination. Therefore, the history whose beginning is the call of Abraham, whose anticipatory zenith the royalty of David, has in Jesus Christ found its goal; He is the bringer of the blessing of Abraham, the rightful King of the Davidian realm. This, moreover, is the significance of the genealogy which succeeds. This list of ancestors is not meant to give a regular pedigree. It is too artificially disposed into parts for that. But it is meant to teach something. In three great periods does the history of Israel run its course: from Abraham to David, from David to the Babylonian captivity, from the Babylonian captivity to Christ. These periods run their course in equal measures of time, and at the end of the third great period of time is Jesus born; not in an accidental time, but when the time of Israel was fulfilled. And—subjoins the next section of the first chapter—as at the appointed time, so in the appointed place; for by God's providence the Saviour, agreeably to the prophecy, was born in the house of Joseph, one of the house of David. In the first chapter we see the drift of the whole gospel plainly appear: Jesus and His history, the fulfillment of the Old Testament.

It is true, the evangelist goes on to say, this comes to pass in a form contradicting the expectation of the Jews. This is the purport of the second chapter. It begins with Bethlehem and concludes with Nazareth. Jesus is the Bethlehemite according to the prophecy. But out of the Bethlehemite has proceeded the Nazarene—in contradiction, as it appears, to the prophecy. For of Nazareth it says nothing; this name does not occur in the whole Old Testament. But this has come to pass through the fault of Israel itself. If Jesus appeared among His people not as the Bethlehemite, but as the Nazarene, as the Galilean; if this was so contradictory to the Messianic expectation, which hoped for a king of the house of David; if the rulers of Israel took such invincible offence at that, it was their own unbelief that brought it about. For it was through the fault of the rulers of Israel that His fate took this turn. Therefore it is not a reproach against the Christian sect, but upon Israel itself does the accusation fall back. Thus, from being a vindication of the Church, the gospel becomes an indictment against Israel. This indictment extends throughout the whole of Matthew, even to that last grievous charge which the evangelist brings against the rulers of the people, that they had, by their lie, deprived their people of the blessing of the Resurrection of Jesus.

But even this apparent contradiction to prophecy in the history of Jesus, the evangelist goes on to say, is in truth agreeable to it. He was to be called a Nazarene, *i. e.*, what the Old Testament prophesies concerning the low estate and obscurity of the Messiah, something which the Jewish interpretation was wont so lightly to explain away: this is fulfilled therein. And if the proud rulers of the people took such offense that Jesus chose Galilee rather than Judea as the theatre of His activity, and if that was so contrary to the expectations which they cherished—is not this also agreeable to prophecy? For the people that sit in the region and shadow of death were to see the light of the new day, according to the word of Isaiah. \*

\* Is. 9. Matt. iv: 14-16



And therefore it is also of set purpose that Matthew limits himself to the Galilean ministry of Christ and emphasizes this so exclusively. With that sermon on the mount of Galilee, in which He promulgates the ordinances of His kingdom, the evangelist begins the portrayal of the prophetic ministry of Jesus in Galilee, and with the appearance of the Risen One in the circle of His adherents upon a mountain in Galilee he concludes his gospel; but from this mountain of Galilee Jesus commissions His disciples to go forth into all the world: "Go hence and make all nations my disciples; and behold, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Thus the second David, from these slight beginnings, and from within these narrow boundaries, set up His everlasting kingdom, in which the blessing of Abraham shall become the portion of all nations.

Christianity is the higher fulfillment of the Old Testament: this is the thought of the Gospel of Matthew, as it is carried through from the beginning to the end of it. Christianity has its roots in Israel. Our New Testament therefore begins with this gospel, which connects the appearing of Jesus and the message concerning Him with the Old Testament, demonstrating it to be the fulfillment of this. In Israel the Church found her first habitation. There then the first Gospel had its origin.

But the preaching of the Gospel was also to pass over to the Gentiles. To establish it among them as well as in Israel was the vocation of Peter. He began the mission among the Gentiles. We have a memorial of his work as the founder of this, in the discourse which he delivered in the house of the Roman centurion Cornelius in Cæsarea. The outline of this, which Luke has preserved for us,\* constitutes the programme which is carried out in the Gospel of Mark.

This Second Gospel is referred by tradition to Peter. Tradition makes Mark, as a companion of Peter, to have gathered in a gospel the discourses which Peter had delivered among the Gentiles. This tradition finds its confirmation in the gospel itself. It is the production of a Jewish Christian, but, as it is

\*Acts x: 36-41.

easy to see, intended for Occidental Gentiles. It evidently goes back to sources derived from Peter. The very first parts conduct us into the vicinity of Peter, who thus appears as the authority for them. And it is not so rounded and complete a whole as the first Gospel, but it brings before our eyes a series of images in rapid succession and with the lively colors and separate pictorial traits of the eye-witness and oral narrator, answerably, moreover, to the impetuous, animated character of Peter, one, too, which Mark may not improbably have shared with him.

What is the fundamental thought which controls this gospel? Without lingering over the childhood and youthful history of Jesus, it conducts us at once into the midst of His public ministry, showing us how He heals the sick, drives out the demons, preaches the gospel. It is the element of mighty, astounding power, in His activity, but at the same time the element of manifoldly pressed, consuming unrestfulness, which is here portrayed to us. It is not a doctrine touching the person of Jesus which he gives, nor even the teaching of Jesus which he brings—deeds of Jesus is it which he relates, and what astonishment they aroused among the people, in order thereby to make on us also an impression of the mighty power which revealed itself in Him. This is his intention. We see Jesus in His labor, in His miracles, in His healings, above all of the possessed, how the powers of nature stand ready at His command, how the spirits of the deep bow themselves before Him. But also how He allows Himself no rest, how He consumes away in this ministry of His life. No other gospel emphasizes this side of His activity so strongly and repeatedly as this,\* even to that remarkable scene when His friends fear that He might fall beside Himself, and endeavor to withdraw Him by force from the concourse of people.† It is the element of mighty power, and at the same time of self-surrendery and self-sacrifice in His ministry, which this Gospel aims to bring into view, and the impression of which it aims to call forth in the reader.

\* i: 33, 36, 45. ii: 2. iii: 9-10, 20, etc.

† iii: 21.

This corresponded to the first grade of instruction, and above all to the instruction of Gentiles. For them it was necessary that the form of Jesus should first be painted before their eyes, in order to evoke a general sense and feeling of that new and great thing which in this form had entered the world. The world had become old, and sought something new—new forces of life, new revelations of the Godhead.

In Jesus—so does this Gospel preach—a new Divine power has been revealed, a miraculous manifestation, overmastering in its effect, and of miraculous energies for the healing of the languishing world.

This was the first grade of instruction. Upon it rested then the second grade, which is represented then by the Gospel of LUKE. The evangelist himself, in his prosemium, explains the object of his Gospel. It is dedicated to a Roman of rank, who according to the usage of the time, was then expected to make it his object to extend its circulation, and it is intended to subserve the further advancement of his knowledge of the faith. The evangelist speaks of many essays which were made to commit to writing the evangelical history. We have especially to look for these upon the soil of Gentile Christianity, where the immediate living tradition was not found, and occasion was thereby given to commit to writing what had been heard from the messengers of Jesus. But we may well suppose these to have been exceedingly incomplete attempts, which were subsequently driven out of circulation by the work of Luke, which carried out the same design in a more comprehensive manner.

It is easy to discover what thought has controlled in the composition of this gospel, if we compare it with the Acts of the Apostles, which form the second part of this great historical work of Luke. In the admirable exposition of the Acts, written by Baumgarten in Rostock in his better days, he has given to this book the title: *From Jerusalem to Rome*. This completely expresses its tenor. It aims to portray the progress of the gospel from Jerusalem to Rome, from the soil of Israel to that of the Gentile world. It therefore concludes with the pro-

clamation of the gospel in the capital city of the Gentile world by Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles. From this goal Luke now looks back, and pursues the way of the word of God, which has brought the new age of salvation, even into the very first beginnings. On this account he begins earlier than the others with the first angelic message, which was vouchsafed to Zacharias the priest in the stillness of the sanctuary of the Temple at Jerusalem, and the marvelous Annunciation, which was accorded to the Virgin Mary in the privacy of the maiden's chamber at Nazareth. After this he adduces the other testimonies of the dawning of the new age of salvation: how the two women Mary and Elizabeth discourse thereof with each other, how Zacharias the priest at the naming of his son speaks thereof to the guests of his house; to this is added the angelic message to the shepherds in the field, the prophecy of the aged Simeon, until the series of these testimonies closes with the testimony rendered to himself, at twelve years old, by the boy Jesus in the Temple. From such a beginning we see plainly the controlling thought of the gospel: it is the progress of the word of God, which proclaims the new age of salvation.

But who is it, that brings this new age? Matthew, in his gospel, goes back to Abraham, implying: Jesus is the goal of the history of Israel. Luke goes back to Adam, implying: Jesus is the goal of the history of mankind. And Adam was of God, so does Luke (iii: 38) conclude his genealogy. As Adam proceeded immediately out of the hands of God, so has Jesus been bestowed on mankind by a wonderful act and operation of God. He is the Second Adam, the starting point of a new mankind and of a new history. And as at first the Spirit of God hovered over the earth, and out of her womb called forth the living creations up to God's Man: so here the Spirit of God hovered over the womb of the Virgin, and out of her caused the Son of God to arise, who should bring mankind to the goal of its history. And if Matthew proves concerning Him who was the goal of the history of Israel, that He was born when the time of Israel was fulfilled, Luke proves concerning Him who was to fulfill the aim

of the history of mankind, that He was born when the time of the Gentile world was fulfilled. For with the culmination of the universal empire of Rome does the beginning of the kingdom of God coincide: it was a decree of Cæsar Augustus, which brought Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem, that here the promised Bringer of the new age might be born.

Now what is the character of this new age? It has always been acknowledged, that Luke's gospel has a Pauline character. This appears in the two truths, which Paul shared, it is true, with the other Apostles, but which it was his especial vocation to carry energetically through to all the consequences involved in them: namely, that salvation is the free grace of God, and that it is intended for all the world. Think of the parable of the Publican in the temple, who went to his house justified, or of Jesus going with the Publican Zaccheus, and of the famous 15th chapter with its three parables of the Lost Sheep, of the Lost Piece of Money, and of the Prodigal Son. Everywhere here we have the Pauline doctrine, of saving, forgiving, justifying grace, in the mouth of the Lord. To this we may add, at the very first coming forward of Jesus, in the synagogue at Nazareth, His reference to the widow of Sarepta and Naaman the Syrian, two Gentiles, to whom salvation came rather than to the Jews, or the repeated commendation of the Samaritans. We see thus, in the beginnings of the evangelical history, the prophecy of the Pauline period, in which salvation should be proclaimed to all the world. Thus this Gospel serves to show the Christians from among the Gentiles, how the preaching of free grace, which they had received, was already grounded and prepared for in the work of the life of Jesus. He, the Great Witness of the Truth, has brought the message of salvation, which since then is going through the world. Such an announcement was well calculated to give to a believer of the Gentiles to know, as Luke in his dedication expresses himself, the certainty of the things wherein he had been instructed.

The first grade of instruction, as reflected by the Gospel of Mark, was rather intended to make a general impression,

which was to dispose men to faith in the great and new revelation of God. This grade was to be followed by a second, which should bring the gracious meaning and purport of this revelation into full and clear knowledge. This was the work of the Gospel of Luke. We now come to the fourth gospel.

Peter and Paul were dead; on the soil of the Pauline churches there were developing aberrations of the most critical character, dangers which Paul had foreseen, but whose development falls within the last decades of the first century. Misinterpreting and abusing the Pauline doctrine of freedom from the Law of Israel, some insisted upon a false freedom and spirituality of life, whereby they pretended to be inwardly lifted above all law and above sin, while outwardly they served the flesh. And this false doctrine of freedom, which severed the unity of the Christian life into a life of the spirit and a life of the flesh, rested upon a false doctrine of Jesus Christ. By misrepresentation and abuse of such utterances of Paul, as that he did not know Jesus Christ after the flesh, or that "the Lord is the Spirit," the holy unity of the person of Jesus Christ was dissolved, by volatilizing His higher Divine being into a spirit, which only hovered as an idea over the human reality Jesus of Nazareth, and no longer stood in any living connection therewith. To withstand these aberrations was John's vocation. And this state of things called into existence the Gospel of John, which says the highest and deepest things concerning Jesus that can be said of Him.

I can well believe it not unknown to you, that the question whether the fourth gospel is the work of the Apostle John, or whether it is not rather the work of a Christian philosopher of the second century, has in modern times become the subject of many and animated discussions. It would carry us too far to enter into these. We will content ourselves with the observation, that it gives itself out for a work of the Apostle John.

When the evangelist writes: "We beheld his glory," he designates himself as an eye-witness. But that he has a precise knowledge and living apprehension of circumstances and



personalities, is indisputable. And when he gives the names of the other Apostles, but on the other hand never names the Apostle John, but when he wishes to designate him, describes him by the words: "the disciple whom Jesus loved," we are allowed in this description to recognize the writer of the gospel. And as in the first gospel the writer reveals himself by the fact that he makes the day when he was called to follow Jesus the central point of his delineation of the Galilean ministry of Jesus, so also does the writer of the fourth gospel disclose himself in a similar way. For, whereas in that unnamed disciple, who, at the Baptist's utterance: "Behold the Lamb of God," adhered together with Andrew to Jesus, the readers of the gospel have always seen the Apostle John, it is precisely the hour of the day in which this young man's permanent adhesion to Jesus took place, that is noted by the author of the gospel. "And it was about the tenth hour," are the words. Involuntarily does the mention of this never-to-be-forgotten hour flow from his pen, this hour in which his whole life took its decisive bent. In this touch of memory we cannot overlook the author's hand.

Yet let us pass over to consider the characteristic features of the gospel itself.

The fourth gospel is more chronologically laid out than the others. The narrative proceeds along the thread of the different journeys of Jesus to the feasts at Jerusalem. It does not, like the first three, conduct us into the manifoldness of daily life, and give us individual scenes of His activity, as it repeated itself through weeks and months. Out of the lowlands of these more monotonous and ordinary occurrences, he lifts us on the heights of the history of Jesus. With long steps he leads us forward over the summits of the life of Jesus from one stage of His conflicts with His adversaries to another. On this account he brings into conspicuous view Jesus' journeys to the feasts. For in Jerusalem was the seat of the opposition. Every visit to Jerusalem was a new hostile meeting with His adversaries and an intensification of this conflict. No other gospel is so dramatically disposed as this. It is the great drama of the



life of Jesus which we here follow. We see how the conflict is preparing, how the plot complicates itself, how the *dénouement* comes in the death and in the glorification of Jesus.

This history, however, is not a history of external occurrences. It is not men taken at random, that act. They are only bearers of great antagonisms of fundamental principles. That most general antagonism of the two great powers of good and evil, of light and darkness, of God and Satan, which, since that pregnant word at the beginning of history, touching the seed of the serpent and the Seed of the woman, controls all history; this, in the life of Jesus, has complicated itself into the hardest knot. In this life these two powers come into sharp collision with each other in Jesus and the Jews, in Jesus and Judas.

Therein lies the tragical grandeur and the profound gravity of this drama. In view of it the significance of individual men disappears. Whether they are Pharisees or Sadducees, whether they are called this or that—are trivial matters. That they are representatives of the one or the other bent of the spirit—this is the essential point. Upon this the evangelist has his view fixed. It is not the outer history that that he would relate to us, but he would fain unveil to us the essence of this history, and its deep inner significance. Not as a mere annalist does he write the story, but as a prophet, in the spirit of prophecy, freely moulding the external material, in order to bring into a stronger light the hidden spiritual background of the events. So we are to understand him.

And as it is the very foundations of the history which He discloses, so it is also the ultimate depths of the truth concerning the person of Jesus, which he utters. It is true that in the other gospels also He is called the Son of God, but in John He bears this appellation in the highest sense. Mark had gone back as far as the Baptist, Matthew as far as Abraham, Luke as far as Adam. But John carries back the roots of the life of Jesus into God. There in the bosom of eternity He shows to us His origin and His original home. The first three, however far they go back, still remain within the bounds of time: John

prolongs the line of the life of Jesus into eternity. From eternity has He proceeded forth, from thence is He derived, not from beneath, but from above. "I have proceeded forth from God and come into the world." He is the Son of God in the absolute sense. In Mark He is the Son of God in the new Divine power which has become manifest in him; in Matthew as the fulfillment and the goal of the Old Testament, the Bringer of the Kingdom of David; in Luke as the goal of the history of mankind and as the manifestation of the new line of grace; in John as the manifestation of God Himself. "Whoso seeth me, seeth the Father." For the Father is in Him; He is the presence of God on earth, the human presence of God; in His life of man, in His flesh and blood He bears eternal life, and the fullness of the Godhead. To the above mentioned severance of the Divine and human in Christ, John opposes his great utterance, in which he fuses the two sides into the most intimate unity: The Word became flesh.

This presentation of the person of Jesus has an abiding significance for all time. There are two errors, which in the view and doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ, from that time until to-day, stand opposed to each other. On the one hand, the rationalistic school of thought blots out the Divine in Jesus, and leaves only the mere man, declaring this the main matter; on the other hand, a false philosophy declares the higher idea, which is represented or has become manifest in Christ, the main matter, and the historical reality of Jesus a thing indifferent. On the one hand we have a history without idea, on the other an idea without history. John's intuition has beheld both the heavenly and the earthly, the eternal and historical, God and man in Jesus Christ as conjoined and fused into unity, and in his delineation of Jesus Christ, he entwines both into the inseparable unity: The word became flesh. This is the place where Godhead and Manhood are united in one, where all perfect fullness appears.

You see: the Gospels constitute a climax. The Gospel of Matthew shows us the roots of Jesus in the soil of Israel, and the connection of Christianity with the Old Testament. Its

face is primarily turned towards the past. From thence it gives us to understand the present and future, as the goal and the consummation of the past. The Gospel of Mark places the image of Jesus before our eyes as a new, great, overmastering phenomenon, which at once subdues us and attracts us, and awakens in us the presentiment that a new and blessed age has therein dawned upon the world. The Gospel of Luke proclaims to us this new and blessed age as the age of Divine grace, as the revelation of the compassionate heart of God towards the world of sinners. The Gospel of John draws the last curtain away, and lets us look into the whole deep background of the mystery of God, that has become manifest in Jesus: eternal life in time, full of grace and truth. This is the farthest background of the life of Jesus. The three first Gospels also give intimations of this background, against which stands in relief that history of Jesus in this world, which they relate: to Him is all power given in Heaven and earth; and no man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any one the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him. This utterance of Jesus in Matthew intimates what is the background of His life in time: it comprehends in itself a mystery, a Divine mystery. John withdraws the last veil and discloses this hidden background of His history, and the mystery of His being: I in the Father, and the Father in me; whoso seeth me, seeth the Father.

Thus the Gospels conduct us from step to step, and add trait to trait in the portrait of Jesus. Out of their variations there grows up before us His perfect image. And these variations of the four are not contradiction, but fullness. So has God disposed it, that the infinite mystery might be brought near to us by the manifoldness of presentation. Various as is the form of this—it is One and the Same whom they present to us that we may behold His glory. And as in the Old Testament the glory of Jehovah was enthroned upon the four cherubim, so do the Four Gospels bear up the glory of Jesus Christ, and present it before our eyes, that we too may be able to say: We beheld His glory!

### III. THE APOSTLES' CREED.

BY THE LATE REV. S. H. GIESY, D.D.

#### I. THE GENESIS OF THE APOSTLES' CREED.

Two creeds stand in the *Book of Common Prayer*. Different only in name and form, they are but one in essential facts and scope, together constituting the ancient and authoritative expression of the Christian faith. Doubtless, in inward substance and contents of truly Apostolic origin and weight, they are still deservedly and widely held in the highest veneration and esteem. And substantial agreement, in any such case, is of more account a great deal than unvarying uniformity of type and language.

The recitation of the Creed as an invariable and necessary part of Divine service is an ancient custom; in the Eastern Church dating back to the order of Timothy, archbishop of Constantinople, in the reign of the emperor Anastasius (A. D., 521); and in the English Church, found in regular liturgical use at least three centuries before the Norman conquest. Whatever revolutions have since taken place in civil, social and religious life, there has been no change in this particular. How well it is so. Such stated recitation of the Creed in anything like its old historic sense—the well-understood *regula fidei* of primitive Christianity—must hold us both, “sure and steadfast,” to these external verities, as the sheet anchor the vessel to its moorings in the wild sweep of the storm. It is ever a standard of truth and a safeguard against false doctrine, against all loose and disjointed thought. Upon its depreciation or neglect is sure to follow a Nemesis, either of no faith or wild,

unregulated faith. In Puritanic irreverence it has been esteemed and treated as "the relic of a by-gone age," and publicly proclaimed such by its best men, its representative thinkers, much to its own spiritual damage and hurt.

Such folly and misguided prejudice are now fast passing away. A wave of better thought and feeling, with evident improvement in faith and worship, is sweeping over the Puritan mind. As proof, take the wonderfully able and commendatory article in the *Andover Review*, December, 1884. "There are," the writer says, "many signs of a revived interest in the Apostles' Creed. In non-liturgical churches its use has been rapidly increasing. The recent recommendation by the Creed-Commission of the Congregational Churches in this country, that it be employed in the admission of members will doubtless promote this movement. For ourselves, we welcome it and should be gratified to aid in expediting and enhancing it, and making it more intelligent." As further proof, take the fact of its stated introduction into the worship of not a few such churches, where less than a quarter of a century ago an attempt of this kind would have aroused a perfect storm of indignation, as marking an unmistakable and tremendous stride in the direction of Rome. No recent utterance is so remarkable as the *Independent's* most enthusiastic endorsement of the wish "that the Apostles' Creed might supersede in the forms of admission to the Church, the more cumbrous Creeds generally in use."

Eastern and Western Christendom was wholly unlike. The Apostles' was the Creed of the Western, the Nicene of the Eastern Church. The Eastern mind was more speculative, mystic, given to nice and subtle distinctions; the Western more practical, direct and earnest. This makes the characteristic differences of the two Creeds.

Greek, the richest and most flexible language ever spoken or written, was peculiarly well adapted to the expression of the nicest shades of thought. The heresies which disturbed the early Church were the product of the subtle Greek intellect; and to it we owe the earliest Creed. But true to its genius, it was

diffusive, metaphysical, expanded, while the Western or Latin Creed was as necessarily simpler, more concise and matter-of-fact, less abstruse, more crisp. Down to the third century, Greek was the language and literature of the world, everywhere the vehicle of thought and intercourse, spoken as readily at Rome, as at Athens and Alexandria. Says Cicero, "Græca leguntur in omnibus fere gentibus; Latina suis finibus exiguis sane, continentur"—Latin a mere provincial tongue; Greek universal in the Roman empire. As will hereafter appear, the Apostles' Creed was first Greek in language as in origin, while passing under the reconstruction and simplifying method of Western thought and intellect.

The Nicene symbol is involved in no obscurity whatever as to origin. Date and details, occasion and circumstances, are given with the preciseness of historic facts. Thus cautiously, however, the eighth of the *Articles of Religion* speaks of the briefer one: "that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed," scrupulously holding aloof from any direct sanction of the traditional idea of Apostolic composition "*membratim articulatus inquit.*"

Of undoubted antiquity, nevertheless it has not been so named because of anything like direct Apostolic action, either as to details or form. Its true Apostolicity, as will soon be made clear, rests on a deeper ground than any such collective and concerted dictation of its separate parts. An old tradition to that effect, derived from the fourth century, was, indeed, currently reported and believed, which Waterland has characterized as a "vulgar (common) error." If the sermon in which the passage occurs be genuine, Ambrose [A. D. 340] was the first to make the public statement that "the twelve Apostles, as skillful artificers, assembled together and made a key by their common advice, that is the Creed; by which the darkness of the devil is disclosed, that the life of CHRIST may appear." At all events, a half-century later, from Rufinus [A. D. 390], a presbyter of Aquileia and an ecclesiastical writer of some note, who wrote a commentary on the Creed, *Expositio Symboli*

*Apostolici*, we have this fuller statement, given, he says, as an ancestral tradition: "that after the ascension of our Saviour, and the effusion of the HOLY GHOST, before the Apostles separated from each other to go into the several parts of the habitable world to preach the gospel to them, they settled amongst themselves the rule of their future preaching, to prevent their teaching different doctrines during their separation unto those whom they should unite into the Christian faith; wherefore they assembled all together and being full of the HOLY GHOST, they composed the Creed; each one inserting what he thought convenient; and ordained it to be a test of their future sermons, and a rule to be given unto the faithful." Rufinus supports this mechanical construction of the Creed by a false explanation of *Symbolum* (from *συμβάλλειν* in the sense *to contribute*), being in his view the collation or throwing together of the chief points of the Creed. Sir Peter King, in his quaint but most instructive book, *The Apostles' Creed with Critical Observations*, sees in the name as thus applied, and in that comes nearer the truth, a reference to such cabalistic signs and words in common use among pagans when giving free access "to their nocturnal and more intimate mysteries and villainies." Embodying in clear and definite form the Christian faith, the Creed itself was used as such a sign and symbol in connection with the Baptismal service, from the first ages of Christianity. As the badge, and token, and stamp of Christian character, its distinct recitation marked along the centuries this solemn sacramental beginning of a new life.

In thus parcelling out the several articles, some went so far as to definitely settle the particular contribution made by each; St. Peter beginning "I believe in God the Father," and St. Matthias ending with "Life everlasting." Longfellow in his *Divine Tragedy*, lends his poetic pen to this artificial theory, arranging the Creed in twelve parts and assigning to each the name of the supposed author. No notion could well be more unhistorical and impossible; and yet it was held by Roman Catholic and Protestant Christendom as well, even as far down



as the middle of the seventeenth century. And nothing so strange as that this purely legendary idea of the Apostolic origin of the Creed, in such arbitrary style, such independent authorship, should have ever found Synodical endorsement as late as the Council of Trent [A. D. 1545-1563], then already regarded with suspicion, and deemed extremely untrustworthy.\*

Laurentius Valla was the first to call the matter into question, followed by Erasmus and Calvin; but still defended by Peter Myers and Abbé Martigny.

Some have thought that the existence of a fixed and settled formulary from the beginning is to be recognized in such phrases as St. Paul's "analogy of Faith" [Romans xii: 6]; "the doctrine which ye have learned" [Romans xvi: 17]; "that form of doctrine which was delivered" [Romans vi: 17.]; "the form of sound words" [I Timothy i: 13]; "the good deposit" [II. Timothy i: 14]; "the first principles of the oracles of GOD" [Hebrew v: 12]; "the doctrine" on which St. John lays special emphasis [II John 10 v.]; and St. Jude's emphatic and oft-repeated assertion "the faith which was once delivered unto the saints" [St. Jude 3 v]. But in none of these passages is there anything to demand exegetically the existence and stated use of a definite rule of faith, answering in any way

\* "The doctrines which Christian men ought first to hold, are those which the guides and teachers of the faith, the holy Apostles, inspired by the Divine Spirit, have marked out in the twelve articles of the Creed. For when they had received from the LORD a command that, in discharge of their commission from him, they should go forth into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, they determined to compose a formula of the Christian faith, to the end that all men might think and say the same thing, and that there might be no schisms among them whom they called to the unity of the faith; but that they might be perfect in the same mind, and in the same judgment. This profession of the Christian faith and hope, composed by themselves, the Apostles denominated a Creed (symbol): either because it was formed of the various sentences which each contributed, or because they used it as a mark or badge, whereby they might easily distinguish deserters or false brethren, privily brought in, who adulterated the Gospel, from those who bound themselves by the oath of the warfare (army) of CHRIST." [*Catechismus Council, Trident.*]

to the suggestion of an early methodical and authoritative form. On the other hand, "the analogy, or proportion of faith" for instance, to which St. Paul gives such prominence and importance as a rule of interpretation, is, he there affirms, not something outside of Holy Scriptures, something arbitrarily imposed, but an inner necessity, which must rule the sense of God's word, and for that matter every book—its consistent and harmonious self-interpretation, its whole tenor, scope and aim. There certainly could be no surer way of over-throwing the entire and evident sense of the Bible than to select sections, here and there, as best suiting one's particular fancy and end, and making these stand for the whole. Sectarian perversions stand mainly in such arbitrary and self-guided selections of texts. It is still, as it was then, the course pursued by all heresiarchs—thrusting in a partial, and so far forth, false and misleading rule of interpretation. Over against this uniform habit of heresy, ancient and modern alike, the writer of more than one masterly Epistle declares that Scripture is to be interpreted, not *μόνωκωλα*—piecemeal, after the manner of private, selective, and one-sided views—but *κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως*: that is, in a word, with due regard, as Bishop Wordsworth says, "to the general symmetry and harmony of the whole body of Christian doctrine; in this way St. Peter's words are to be understood. "No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation" [II. Peter 1: 20]. How apt, how well-nigh inevitable, private interpretations of Divine truth are to become private misconstructions, eighteen centuries of polemic theology, and a divided Christendom—not a few sects standing on the narrowest meaning of a word—give proof sufficient and mournful. Therefore, the imperative need, as then, so still, of the Apostle's canon of Scripture-interpretation, "the *analogy of faith*."

When St. Paul wrote to Timothy, "that good thing (*τὴν καλὴν παραθήκην*) which was committed unto thee, keep by the HOLY GHOST which dwelleth in us," did he mean, as Tertullian afterwards affirmed, the definite *deposit of faith*, the absolute

rule, "from which nothing is to be deducted and to which no addition can be made"? Clearly not, unless the great Latin writer simply meant thereby the elemental principles of the Christian faith as embodied in the baptismal formula—the archetypal creed.

There is just as little historical, as exegetical, ground for the idea of such a fixed and settled canon or compend of faith from the beginning, the composition of the Apostles themselves. Had that been at all the case, it would surely have been handed down with scrupulous care and a deep sense of responsibility for its integrity to the very letter; not a sentence changed, not an iota dropped, not a word crossed; neither detraction allowed, nor addition. But all history is against every supposition of the sort. The silence of the *Acts of the Apostles* as to any such concerted action in the matter is enough to stamp the later tradition as an idle tale. Definite record is here made of one, and only one, Apostolic Council being held [Acts xv. 6-29], convened, one might well suppose, to meet an emergency of far less importance. Deliberate decision is made, and at once communicated to the aggrieved churches by "chosen men." But nowhere in this book do we find the slightest intimation of a second assemblage for any purpose whatever, least of all for the immensely greater interest of a common standard of faith.

Nor a whit less remarkable is the perfect silence of the Apostolic Fathers. Neither the Clementine Homilies, nor the Ignatian Epistles, nor the Apostolic Constitutions, nor the Justinian Apologies, nor yet, more wonderful still, the lately discovered *Teachings of the Twelve Apostles*, contain the slightest reference to the existence of any such original and authoritative Creed. And most significant of all, is the profound silence of the first œcumenical Council of Nicea, convened [A. D. 325] by the Emperor Constantine for the express purpose of formulating the Creed. Had those bishops, gathered in solemn conclave from all parts of the world, for the purpose of taking action on the central and most vital point of the Creed, known

aught about "a symbol of purely Apostolic composition and character," it would have been, plainly enough, the absolute and ultimate ground of appeal—a voice, as it were, from the actual presence of CHRIST Himself, not to be withstood, not to be hushed or denied; and nothing more unlikely than that it should then have been superseded by another, though a more copious and, perhaps careful, expression of the faith as necessary to salvation.

Again, the variations of the Creed forbid the thought of direct Apostolic authorship and authority. Agreeing, indeed, in the main facts and in the general scope, yet so great was the diversity here that no two provincial churches scarcely may be said to have had precisely the same symbol; one omitting this article, another that, and none, as far down as the middle of the sixth century, repeated the completing clause of the ninth article, "The Communion of Saints."

Doubtless, for several centuries the Creed of the Latin or Western Church was in a state of modification; here recited in an abbreviated, there in a more expanded form. In fact, it is not until the eighth century that it first makes its appearance in the exact words and order we now have it. Pirminius [A. D. 750], an ecclesiastical writer and bishop, laboring in France and Germany, is the first to give it in this precise and permanent form. Going back just a century [A. D. 650], we find, in a Gallican Sacramentary, the words, "Maker of heaven and earth" first added, bringing the opening article into its present complete shape. A century yet earlier [A. D. 550], in a Creed preserved in the works of Eusebius, the article "The Communion of Saints" appears for the first time. Three other expansions are here introduced, "was conceived" before "by the HOLY GHOST"; "dead" before "and buried"; and "sitteth at the right hand of the Father" becomes "sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty." In the Creed of Nicetas, bishop of Aquileia [A. D. 450], a century yet earlier, the word Catholic is used for the first time in connection with the article, "The

Holy Church." And fifty years still earlier, Augustine, the great bishop of Hippo [A. D. 400], comes forward as the most remarkable character and the most voluminous writer in the early Church—in spirit, and theology, and literary activity the forerunner of Calvin. From his writings we learn that the word "suffered" was for the first time placed before "under Pontius Pilate"; and the article "the life everlasting" reappears as originally it had stood in the Creed of Cyprian.

About the same time [A. D. 390-400], Rufinus, a priest of Aquileia, now Ulm, on the Danube, in the earliest commentary we have on the Creed, furnishes two forms, the Aquilean and the Roman, differing in nothing save that in the first named the words "invisible and impassible" are added to the first article, as an outspoken protest against the Patripassian heresy—that is, that God the Father suffered in the crucifixion.

In no essential particular, however, does the form of Rufinus differ from that of Marcellus, a half century earlier [A. D. 341], bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, himself a Greek, and doubtless giving the Creed as originally written or traditionally handed down in that language. It makes the nearest approach to the Apostolic symbol. Translated, it runs thus: I believe in GOD ALMIGHTY, And in JESUS CHRIST, His only-begotten Son, our LORD, Born from the HOLY GHOST and Mary the Virgin, Crucified under Pontius Pilate and buried. And on the third day He rose again from the dead, Ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of the FATHER, From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And in the HOLY GHOST. The holy Church, The forgiveness of sins, The resurrection of the body, The life everlasting.

At the Council of Nice he espoused the cause of Athanasius with warm though eccentric zeal, aiding in shaping that more elaborate symbol. The question of his subsequent orthodoxy carries no weight under the circumstances. It was through Arian pressure he was deposed from his see at the Council of Jerusalem [A. D. 335], and taking refuge at Rome he set forth a defence of the purity of his faith in a letter to Pope Julius I.,

embodying a Creed which the learned Caspari pronounces the Greek text of the original Apostles' Creed. In a recent volume entitled, *The Greek Origin of the Apostles' Creed*, Dr. Baron, after a thorough examination of the matter, declares that the Greek, so "far from being a mere Greek version of the Latin Creed, is the original source of the Latin. It is not pretended by him (Marcellus) to be his own composition, but he says that he received it by tradition from his ancestors in the faith, and had always made it the foundation of his preaching." \*

In his invaluable work, *The Creeds of Christendom*, Dr. Schaff fully corroborates the above statement. "It was heretofore regarded as a translation of the Roman Creed, but Caspari, with a vast amount of learning, has made it almost certain that it is the original Creed of the Roman Church, in which the Greek language prevailed during the first two centuries. It was probably transplanted to Rome from Asia Minor early in the second century. It is simpler and older than the rules of faith of Tertullian and Irenæus."

The Greek origin of the Creed is hardly questioned now. Its first necessity and earliest outline came as a simple and emphatic protest against rising heresies menacing, in its distinctive character, the very existence of Christianity. These were pre-eminently Greek, as the word itself, representing various phases of this heretical thought, fully indicates Gnosticism, from *γνώσις*. The marvellous precision of the Greek intellect in definitions and the supple adaptability of the language to the nicest shades of thought offered at once the readiest channel for this secret and wide-spread negation of the simple Gospel. The Gnostic denial to CHRIST makes this brief formula necessary, with special stress laid on His birth of a human mother whose name is thus handed down in history.

\* "Having received this faith from the Divine Scriptures, and having been taught it by those who, under God, were my forefathers, I both preach it in the Church of God, and now write it to thee, retaining the copy thereof in my own keeping." [Epiphanius Hæres. III, 72. 3. p. 23.]

Greek, besides, was the commercial language of the world. The Old Testament, as read in the synagogues of the foreign Jews, was Greek. And the books of the New Testament were originally Greek; so the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, and as well the first Apologists down to the opening of the third century. Long before Latin Christianity as such was begun, Rome itself was the seat of Greek learning and culture of a high order. It was even there the common language of the infant Church. The area over which it was diffused was co-extensive with the Roman empire.

Light is from the East, and from the East came Christianity. "It was Greek missionary enterprise, and not Roman, that carried the Christian faith to Gaul." Milman stands authority for the statement that "for a considerable part of the first three centuries the Churches of the West were Greek religious colonies. Their language was Greek, their organization Greek, their Scriptures Greek, their writers Greek, and many vestiges and traditions show that their ritual, their Liturgy, was Greek;" and, it would seem, as a necessary part of it, the Creed was also Greek.

Not Rome, but North Africa, in the person of Tertullian [A.D. 200,] was the parent of Latin Christianity. He was the first of the Latin Fathers to formulate the Creed, giving it pretty much as we now have it. But preceding him by a full generation was Irenæus [A.D. 170], bishop of Lyons, the most distinguished theologian, the most prolific and powerful writer of the ante-Nicene period. Born and educated in Asia Minor, the pupil of Polycarp, himself the disciple of St. John, he stood wonderfully near the Fountain-head of truth. Although by birth and training Eastern, perfectly familiar with Greek philosophy, yet, in his distant home and diocese in Gaul, he was among the foremost to combat with singular directness and power the Gnostic heresies which struck at the centrality of the Faith, turning the true humanity of CHRIST into a mere by-play, a theophany, something transient and apparitional, simply a spectral form wanting all realness. In these early



and hard fights for the truth his name deservedly ranks first. His great work, "*Adversus Hæreses*," shows him to be a very *malleator hæreticorum*, without consideration and without mercy. Over against the earlier forms of Gnosticism he gives us, in the first Creed extant, the truth, as he apprehends it, "as it is in JESUS," in substantial agreement with, but not in the exact language of, the symbol in its present form. Every article marks a battle-field—a hard and bitter contest.

Such clear reference to the false tendencies then actually at work in the Church, and threatening the very overthrow of the Faith, is monumental evidence of the highest Christian antiquity. For, already before the last of the Apostles had passed away, Cerinthus had sown the seed of heresy; and that anti-christ had then already reared its head against which the fourth Gospel and the first Epistle of St. John came as a direct and outspoken protest, flaming with his spirit who would not so much as remain in the bath with the man who denied "*that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh*." Says Sir Peter King in the quaint book already referred to: "Not long after the Apostles' days, and even in the Apostolic age itself, several heresies sprung up in the Church, subversive of the fundamentals of Christianity; to prevent the malignant effects whereof, and to hinder such heretics from an indiscernible mixing themselves with the orthodox Christians, as also to establish and strengthen the true believers in the necessary truths of the Christian religion, the Christian verities opposite to those heresies were inserted in the Creed."

All thought of "any fixed system of words recognized and received as the composition of the Apostles" must be abandoned in the face of the variations in the Creed spreading over seven and a half centuries. In fact, no claim could well be more preposterous and fanciful. On this point the above author's judgment is historically sound. "As for the authors thereof, it cannot be denied but that they were several and many; it was neither the work of one man, nor of one day, but during a long tract of time, passed successfully through several hands

ere it arrived to its present perfection ; the composure of it was gradual and not instantaneous ; the manner whereof, I apprehend to have been these two ways : first, some of the articles therein were derived from the very days of the Apostles ; secondly, the others were afterwards added by the primitive doctors and bishops, in opposition to gross heresies and errors that sprung up in the Church." Says another : "It was no product of private thinking, here and there. No man can be said to have composed it ; it is no work of the Apostles ; it is no work of bishops and synods ; it must be taken rather as the grand epos of Christianity itself, the spontaneous poem of its own life, unfolded to fit word and expression from the inward consciousness of the universal Church."

Because of the utter failure to make out, by the actual compositions of the Apostles themselves, any such fixed form of the faith answering to what we now have, and of a long time bearing their honored name, is it asked, What becomes of the pretentious though venerated title ? Why should any odor of special and time-honored sanctity still attach to it ? Ought not the name, enshrining thus an historic impossibility, be at once abandoned ? Is it not in itself an unmitigated falsehood and lie, a manifest misnomer ? This ground is boldly taken in some quarters. A recent critic condemns the old title as utterly misleading ; lending to it "a special sanctity that does not belong to it ;" getting to itself veneration and authority under a name to which it has not a shadow of right.

And yet is the old tradition as to its Apostolic character, handed down from the earliest times, wholly false ? Is there no true and original sense in which, after all, it merits in full, as such, its venerable title, *The Apostles' Creed* ? False indeed, as to letter, mere outward form and history, nevertheless, as to its spirit, inward contents and necessary order, is it not absolutely true ? In fact, is there not every reason to believe that the distinctive and proper name came into general use, and followed it down all the centuries, because of its

undeniably close agreement with the original type and norm of Apostolic teaching?

With all the diversity, which so plainly appears on the face of the history, there was, as anybody can see who will see, essential unity in the substance of the Creed and the very order as well in which the articles are brought to stand to each other. The logic of precedent facts makes the logic of faith. Nothing here like a hap-hazard and artificial arrangement is perceived, but a uniform, perfectly natural and thoroughly logical sequence, showing throughout its several parts the presence and power of such a primordial type of the faith.

And this is not far to seek. It finds its germinal utterance in this first *confession of faith*—this earnest, hearty, prompt response of St. Peter to his Lord's question: "Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?" "THOU ART THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD" [St. Matthew xvi. 13, 16]. This fact of facts contains the whole Christian Creed, as the tiny acorn infolds in its mysterious bosom the majestic oak, from which it grows trunk and branches, by inward necessity. In fact, as it afterward came forward in fuller, more expanded and perfect form, there is absolutely nothing save the distincter utterances of the actual and necessary truths inherent in this foundation principle.

Later on, from His own lips to whom "all power in heaven and in earth" was committed, we have the elemental pattern of the Creed authoritatively set forth in what has ever since been distinctly known as the formula of Christian baptism; "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST" [St. Matthew xxviii. 19]. And thereafter Apostolic conduct and preaching are everywhere and throughout after this fixed and settled scheme, reappearing and emphasized in the three-fold division ruling the Creed through its manifold variations. "This revelation," another has thoughtfully said, "constitutes the sum and substance of Christianity, as the object of faith we profess in coming into the Church. To be baptized into

Christ is to be baptized into the whole mystery of the Trinity as inseparably joined with His person; and the formal acknowledgment of this mystery, accordingly, in the way of solemn response or confession, was associated with the ordinance no doubt, from the beginning."

Nor to any one at all familiar with that chapter of early Christianity, *The Acts of the Apostles*, can there be even a shadow of a doubt that this archetypal Creed ruled their entire sense of the Gospel as they went forth to the grand work laid upon them. Their method was over all the same; baptism, not in one name alone, but in the Triune name, answering in full and everywhere to the Divinely established and clearly understood formula. Their preaching, differing in form and power, as might well be the case, the men themselves differing in intellectual grasp and vigor, was everywhere along the same line. It was pre-eminently *factual*; nor this in any singling out of, or any undue prominence assigned to this or that one fact, to the disparagement of all others, in the modern style of minimizing the Incarnation in order, as supposed, to magnify the Cross, but one connective and consecutive narration—the simple story of redemption as necessarily linked to the person and career of CHRIST beginning with the angelic birth-anthem onward to the glory of Olivet. The view of Christianity they announced was the objective, historic and sacramental, which reappears and reasserts itself in the Creed throughout. For whether one looks into the Gospels or the Epistles, the same order of marvellous facts is maintained. The first Apostolic sermon preached with such wonderful results was a type and sample of all the rest [Acts ii. 22-24]. Says St. Paul, and he may well stand for the whole Apostolic college, "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that CHRIST died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." [1 Corinthians xv. 3, 4.]

No variety of thought and expression shows the least departure from this normative scheme of the Christian faith.

Peter and Paul were as different as two men well could be, and yet as to the actual contents of the Creed, the former is as emphatic and pronounced as the latter. "Blessed be the God and Father of our LORD JESUS CHRIST," we hear him exclaim, "who according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of JESUS CHRIST from the dead." [1 Peter i. 3.]

We come here upon the *raison d'être* of the title "The Apostles' Creed." No misnomer; not in any way misleading. For a much better reason than the mere dictation of its separate parts by them it merits all that the venerable name carries along with it. Coming in to embody and represent the Gospel in living and true form, as they themselves apprehended it and transmitted it, the name itself, the result of no conciliar, but the *consensus* of the Christian centuries, is singularly suitable. It is the Apostles' Creed from inward substance and contents. And, therefore, the old tradition, coming down from ancient times, of its original Apostolic character, is still entitled to earnest respect, albeit in profounder sense and fact.

"We may," says the Rev. Dr. Nevin, "easily see in fact how, with all its changes and variations, the symbol before us may be said to have taken its rise in the very age of the Apostles, and in a certain sense, under their very hands, and to have represented from the beginning the one unvarying faith of the universal Christian world. It needs no very close inspection to perceive that the manifold ways in which it was uttered come all to the same thing at last, and fall back always to a single fundamental formula as their general and common ground. They are at most different translations, more or less full, of one and the same creed, comprising in itself the sense of the new creation in Christ Jesus."\*

\* Mer. Rev. 1849, p. 110, Art. *The Apostles' Creed*. To this is added the testimony of an able German scholar. "As respects its present form, the Creed is post-Apostolic and as well post-Augustinian; but as to its contents, it is not only ante-Augustinian, but wholly and entirely Apostolic. In this single assertion is briefly compressed as a result, the sum and substance of all the

The whole history of the Creeds, Eastern and Western, shows there was a reigning type which naturally rules whatever expansions were afterwards made. In the mind of Irenæus, who stands forth in the history of the primitive Church as the original Creed-maker, this was clearly enough the Apostles' own sense of the personal substance and sweep of the Gospel. He could, then, and very confidently did appeal to an "immovable Faith," which though not in exact form, was nevertheless in sum and substance what, in the course of time, came to bear that definite and honored name. His own language is: "The Church, disseminated throughout the whole world, held it from the Apostles and their disciples, keeping it carefully, as though she occupied but a single house, accepting its contents everywhere as with one heart and soul, and preaching them as from one and the same mouth. The dialects in which it is uttered are different; but the tradition is in force the same. The churches founded in Germany have no other faith and doctrine, nor those in Spain; nor those among the Celts; nor those in the East; nor those in Egypt; nor those in Lybia; nor those of more central situation; but as the Sun, God's workmanship, is over the whole globe one and the same, so also, the evangelical truth shines everywhere and illuminates all who are willing to come to its light." Such testimony, bringing us "into close proximity with the immediate disciples of the Apostles themselves," is of immense weight as to the Apostolic character, if not direct composition of the venerable symbol thus named. With only slightly divergent forms, the early Christians in all parts of the Church—from Jerusalem to Rome, from Ephesus to Lyons, from Alexandria to London—had substantially one and the same Creed.

Under all the circumstances, nothing is so remarkable as its permanence. An old thing, as old in one sense as the Apostles,

critical patristic researches; and, as far as it maintains the Apostolicity of its contents, the truth of this assertion may be proved with equal certainty, respecting every single member or part of it, not excepting the latest additions."—*Zückler*.

though they be not its authors, and yet is it ever young and fresh; the well of truth, and yet offering the same "waters of life" to the generations of earth, coming and going. Through all changes of centuries, changes of tongues and thought, of languages and literature, it has stood the expression and embodiment of historic Christianity universally accepted, while systems of philosophy have quickly chased each other like hurrying waves of the sea breaking to pieces on the shore. Old forms of thought have been swallowed up and lost in the new, while the new in turn has grown antiquated and effete. But for all the centuries of a changeful historic life and philosophic thought, the Creed has maintained its ground; still reverently repeated by gray-haired sire and lisping childhood; and to-day cherished, more than ever, as the common property even of a divided Christendom, it is sure to be, if it ever come, the common basis of its unification.

II. THE ORGANIC STRUCTURE OF THE CREED: THE ORDER OF FACT,  
THE LOGIC OF FAITH.

All life is first germinal—a seed, an acorn, an egg, a dear babe in its mother's arms. Growth is progress; but progress after an inward necessity, the law and limit in each case of its own life and being. It ever stretches up and on to full and perfect form—its own ultimate purpose, its last sense and meaning; trunk and branches, blossom and fruit, winged insect and bird, man that walketh upright, the noblest of this whole order.

Gradually the hidden life unfolds itself, taking on, in due order and time, stock and stem, parts and organs: one making room for, actually necessitating, another. In due proportion and place, they all flow forth, in a truly organic way, from the very substance of the tree, until it stands out to view a symmetrical and beautiful whole. This makes the onward movement of life, from root to verdant coronal, a truly organic and historic process, not written or printed, indeed, as in a higher human world, nevertheless distinctly marked, as any



one may see, in the rings which serve to indicate each year's progress and growth. All spring, from and stand in a common root. All were first involved before they could be thus evolved.

This grand law of gradual, organic development from tiniest seed-principle pervades all nature. Nature does nothing *per saltum*, makes no leaps, knows no Minerva-like prodigies. Not at a bound does the majestic oak come into full form and being; no product of a night. Slowly and patiently it matures; grows by degrees into stoutest wood, fitted for whatever the diversified use of man. Everywhere it is here just as the Divine Master apprehended and stated the invariable law: "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear" [St. Matthew iv. 28]—an inward and essential relation, to which nature never fails to hold itself.

The same well-known physical and historical process obtains in the human world. Manhood comes not by a leap and bound: no sudden spring into mature powers and responsible position. The law of natural birth and growth is absolute. The infant includes the man; but between the child's wail and the man's "I will," what successive stages of development lie! what years of moral discipline, to answer in any degree to St. Paul's grand ideal: "coming unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of CHRIST." [Ephesians iv. 13.]

So human life in the shape of history. The being of Adam included more a great deal than the measure and destiny of a single individual life. He was not *a* man simply, but *the* man, the race, generic humanity, universal man; and from him, as the fountal source of life on its grand moral scale, flowed out all the streams of history, now dark and turbid, now smooth and clear, as these have surged onward making the history of the world, written and unwritten. Here has been movement; and with movement historic progress—the lower, followed by the higher forms of civilization. We do only come to a right apprehension of human life and probation for all time under

what may well be styled the mystery of this organic headship—the fault and fortunes of Adam affecting the entire race through its entire history; on a broader platform sharing his fate, repeating his experience.

Nations are but the expansion of the family, the clan, the tribe. The beginning of human government was of the simplest order; only, long after, more complex. Only as the necessities of adjudication between man and man made themselves actually felt, did the original patriarchal rule give place to the unity and strength of the state humanely organized, thoroughly equipped. But what long and chequered centuries of historic struggle and development—centuries of conflict and strife, of war and woe, of clearing skies and broader ideas—intervened between the earlier despotic rule and the later, better form of liberty under law.

And so we come to the only right conception of human redemption as it is apprehended and seen to be the love and grace of the Father linked to the person and fortunes of JESUS CHRIST, His Son in the flesh, the second Adam, with the first and natural head, alike inclusive of the race: that incarnate life, which beginning in the lowliest birth, under humblest conditions, stretched ever onward through suffering and sorrow to the tragedy of the cross, speedily followed by signal victory over the grave and the open glory of the ascension. "Hence," another has ably said, "in the very nature of the case, the stupendous fact of the Incarnation resolves itself into a series or chain of events, a living historical process rather, by which the mystery enters more intimately and deeply, always into the drama of the world's life, till finally it becomes complete, and is found to have its perfect work, when JESUS was glorified, and the windows of heaven were opened thus [St. John vii. 39], for the power of His Spirit to descend in full measure upon the earth."

Besides every seed has its own law and type of expansion; unfolds invariably along the line stamped upon it from the beginning. This natural law of limitation is absolute, and as old

as creation: "the herb yielding seed and the fruit-tree yielding fruit *after* his kind" [Genesis i. 11]. If a man sow wheat he reaps wheat; if barley he reaps barley. The hidden plastic force works itself out by inward necessity, always after its own fashion and form.

Logical processes are governed by the same inflexible law. Thought must be self-consistent throughout. One of the primary laws of thought is that nothing may be introduced combining elements contradictory of and incompatible with the general idea, principle or proposition. Any incongruity works its prompt dismissal as a *non sequitur*.

The development of the Creed is after a prescribed method, follows the order of Divine facts, and where they end comes itself to its absolute limit. Nothing can thereafter be grafted upon it by conciliar action or papal dictum, as of the essence of faith, beyond these primordial facts, as, for instance, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, or, more recently, that of the Papal Infallibility. The law of Divine limitation is not to be thus transcended by human arbitrary judgment.

Three things are to be said of the Apostles' Creed—It is Organic in its structure; Trinitarian in its conception of the being of GOD; Historic in its scheme of Redemption, *i. e.*, Redemption linked to the constitution of our LORD's person and the facts of His sublime and sinless life.

In its profoundest sense, the Creed has been a growth: the genuine unfolding of a vital kernel of eternal and essential truth along its own lines, by necessary additions from time to time, but ever "homogeneous with its original character and design." This has made it a living, potent thing through all the chequered history of the Christian world. Just this has given it such marvelous permanence, such deathless tenacity of life, such a fixed and settled hold on the heart of each and every succeeding age, and withal such immense moulding power in what deservedly comes forward as genuine historic Christianity.

To answer, in any full and proper sense, its own inherent principle, it had to be thus a thing of growth; each article taking precisely the place it holds, not in any purely accidental way, but because organically involved in what had gone before, as the branches in the trunk, as the stem and leaves in the roots, "as the heat-ray in the solar light-ray," a real and genuine historic product of advancing Christian consciousness; and not a fabrication, a thing of the weaver's loom, beautiful designs artificially put together. The Creed is no such piece of patchwork as the old tradition of its Apostolic composition made it, each one contributing his own particular quota to the common stock; "no piece of mosaic, but an organic unit;" an historic process springing from a single principle or root, each and every complemental part appearing in fitting order and place.

"One scarcely can read the Apostles' Creed," says Dr. Storrs, "without feeling afresh the wonder of that mysterious energy which built it to its compact completeness through stormy ages; starting with the great confession of St. Peter, finding a sovereign shaping law in the Baptismal formula, leaving traces of its working in Ignatius, Justin, Irenæus, more largely in Tertullian, not articulated in the Creed to the world till perhaps the fourth century, not rounding it till still later into the ampler and final form which now is familiar; but all the time, from first to last, holding unabated the primitive faith in the Divine facts, and making those facts the song and the strength of those who receive them. It was, in very deed, age after age, the hymn of the martyrs."

In the old heathen world the necessity of catechetical instruction of a simple and fundamental character gave immediate occasion for the expansion of the Creed. In his day already, Rufinus speaks of this as an ancient custom. "They who are about to receive the grace of Baptism, publicly repeat the symbol in the hearing of the faithful." Ambrose, bishop of Milan, living in the same century, speaks of the custom as one universally observed. This is his account: "Thou wast

asked, Dost thou believe in GOD, the Father Almighty? Thou saidst, 'I do believe;' and thou wast immersed, that is, thou wast buried. Again thou wast asked, Dost thou believe in our LORD JESUS CHRIST, and in His Cross? Thou saidst, 'I do believe,' and thou wast buried with CHRIST. The third time thou wast asked, Dost thou believe in the HOLY GHOST? Thou saidst, 'I do believe;' and the third time wast thou immersed, that thy trine confession might absolve thee from the many falls of thy former life."

A catechism is necessarily rudimental; has to do with first principles, root-truths. St. Peter's confession, earnest, honest, true: "Thou art the CHRIST, the Son of the living God" [St. Matthew xvi. 16], gave the essential seed-truth. And in the best and deepest sense, the Creed is throughout thoroughly Christological, *i. e.*, is ruled in its order and form by the stupenduous facts centering in the person and work of CHRIST; His super-angelic character, His Divine Sonship, His preternatural conception, His true human birth, His normal development, His perfectly natural relations, His tried and tempted, but spotless and perfectly holy life, His tragic end, His real death, His official but temporary sojourn in Hades, His triumphant resurrection and His glorious return to His native home and eternal abode at the right hand of God in the marred body He wore on earth, yet now glorified and transfigured, the very promise and pledge of their rightful entrance into heaven who live in Him and He in them. Thus, like the Gospel itself in these main particulars, the Creed is simply, yet strongly factual. It does but articulate in plain and concise form, and in the precise order of historic occurrence, "the truth," as it originally stood in JESUS Himself. It does but echo the Gospel as that itself passed into history through the one redemptive life, so pure, so perfect, it most graphically sets forth. It does, in fact, only keep actual step to the music of heaven which erst sounded in the ears of woe-begone men on the plains of Bethlehem: "Fear not, for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is BORN

this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is CHRIST the LORD." [St. Luke, ii. 10, 11].

From this initial point, this primal fact—"the Word made flesh, and dwelling among us" [St. John i. 14], the Creed simply makes, step by step, the full and entire movement of that incarnate fact from the mystery of the Virgin's womb to the "life everlasting, flowing directly from it as its own external spring-head and full outcome." That one primal principle and root-mystery determines not only the Divine contents of the Creed, but as well the actual order these severally hold, and the one grand issue towards which they steadily reach and in which they find at length their ultimate purpose, their last sense and meaning. Nothing is purely accidental here. All comes forward in the way of truly organic derivation and out-flow from that seed-principle, this bold answer which St. Peter, standing for the twelve, gave *ex animo*, from a deep and abiding conviction of the eternal Reality, to CHRIST's own probing question: "Will ye also go away?" "LORD, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that thou art that CHRIST, the Son of the living God" [St. John, vi. 67-69]. From this rich kernel has grown the tree of the LORD, so stately and so strong. Given this germinal truth, and all the rest follows by inward necessity and true organic outgrowth.

Reverting again to the figure employed; every seed has first had antecedent relations. It is the product of a parent existence; gathers up in its compass the last results of a vital movement going before. It is itself a living link with unknown ages past.

How profound this primary utterance of the Christian faith, just now under consideration: "The Son of the living God." It carries human thought back to the essential constitution of the Godhead, and connects CHRIST, in the way of eternal generation, with the Head and Fountain of Deity. To accomplish across the centuries all that was graciously contemplated in His advent in the flesh, He must Himself, in the profoundest depths

of His being, be rooted in the one self-subsistent Source of all things. The Incarnation was thus a personal movement from the eternal centre of life and love, not complete in and of itself, but necessarily looking forward to the perpetual and world-wide activity of the HOLY GHOST.

The Creed stands in this threefold division. Rooted in the very mystery of the Trinity, it is of necessity Trinitarian in its conception and adequate presentation of Christianity. How otherwise could it be at all in full harmony with the Baptismal formula of which it is but an amplification and enlargement: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" [*St. Matthew*, xxviii. 19]? And how otherwise could the Apostolic benediction itself be anything but tautological and meaningless diffusion: "The Grace of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, and the love of God, and the communion of the HOLY GHOST, be with you all" [*2 Corinthians* xiii. 14]? No, in its formal structure the Creed does but follow the antecedent pattern of Divine realities. And this mystery of the ever blessed Trinity alone gives to Christianity its truly Scriptural basis and its orthodox form. Hence the tripartite division of the Creed as uniformly printed in all standard liturgical works. And hence the triple form of the answer given in the Church catechism to the question: "What does thou chiefly learn in these articles of thy Belief"? "First, I learn to believe in GOD the Father, who hath made me and all the world.

"Secondly, In GOD the SON, who hath redeemed me and all mankind.

"Thirdly, in GOD the HOLY GHOST, who sanctifieth me and all the people of GOD."

Of course, it is not to be taken that the Incarnation first makes the triune form of the Divine nature thus prominently brought to view. CHRIST is not the ground or source of the Trinity. He does bring to actual revelation in the world the essential and eternal constitution of the Godhead; "not the creator of the Trinity, nor simply its proclaimer; but the form



of its explication in the economy of time, the medium by which it manifests itself for faith, and so for knowledge, in the consciousness of the world." It was a true word which Irenæus said, "CHRIST did not for the first time begin to be the Son of GOD, when He was incarnate, but, on the contrary, He had always co-existed with the Father."

However, it is a matter of grave concern to not a few persons that there is in the Bible no one "clear categorical statement" of the doctrine of the Trinity. Instead of this being an occasion for anxiety and distress, it is really a cause for quiet confidence and satisfaction. The revelation of Divine things stands, not in naked words, but in the order of living facts, a truly Divine deed, and not a mere "GOD-SAID." All the better satisfied we may be that the doctrine of the Trinity stands in the organic structure of Holy Scripture, itself thus answering to ordering facts, and not in any number of isolated passages picked out here and there in a purely mechanical and arbitrary way. But that the eternal truth comes, not as water poured through a tube, but by the living stream and actual outflow of history.

St. Peter's confession, "Thou art the CHRIST, the Son of the Living GOD," involved from the first the faith and apprehension of GOD in three personal distinctions, Father, Son and HOLY GHOST. Divine Sonship presupposes Divine Fatherhood. CHRIST is GOD's self-revelation. He Himself tells us, "No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and He to whom the Son shall reveal Him." [St. Matthew xi. 27 ; St. Luke x. 22.] "No man hath seen GOD at any time ; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him" [St. John i. 18]. "In this is manifested the love of GOD towards us, because that God sent His only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through Him" [1 John iv. 9]. So St. Paul's complete statement of his own profound sense of the mystery of the Word made flesh, "In Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily" [Colossians ii. 9]. And, if possible, so even more explicitly and strongly, the writer of the Epistle to the

Hebrews, "The Brightness of the Father's glory and the express Image of His Person" [Hebrews i. 3].

The mirror before which a man stands reflects back his likeness. It is but the lifeless image of the true. However, the image stamped on the face of that man's son is, as we say, the father's *living likeness*—his second self; the father over again in the son. CHRIST is the adequate, as He is the personal Image of God, His living expression and embodiment [*καρὰ τῆς ὁμοεικείας αὐτοῦ*, Hebrews i. 3]. His own self-reflection [*εἰκὼν τῶν θεῶν τῶν ἀσώτων*, Colossians i. 15; *ὃς ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τῶν θεῶν*, 2 Corinthians iv. 4], the Living Mirror, as it were, in which He shows Himself to man, the loving Father that He is [St. John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 10], and by which, discerning His eternal favor, the sons of men can draw ever so near to Him with filial confidence, saying without fear and trembling, Abba Father. That in these phrases, the sacred writers assert the Divine consubstantiality of the Son is the general testimony of the fathers. Said Basil, "CHRIST is not like an image made by art, but He is a *living Image* or rather Life itself, not in outward fashion, but in very essence itself, preserving the invariability of God." "A living Image of the Living one," says Gregory Nazianzen.

Though redemption was linked to the person of CHRIST by reason of its Divine-human constitution, yet was it neither to be limited to His person nor His Palestinian home and people. He was not a Jew for the Jews only, as Luther a German for the Germans. He is a universal man, the representative and generic head of the race, the second Adam [2 Corinthians xv. 47]. His Saviourhood is comprehensive and world-wide.

" In Him the tribes of Adam boast  
More blessings than their father lost."

Life and salvation are to stream forth from Him o'er all the world, as light and heat from the sun. His redemption is "once for all" [Hebrews x. 10].

But how is this comprehensive purpose in CHRIST to become,

as the ages roll in and on, a gracious realization? There is needed here a fresh activity, proceeding from the Divine centre, a personal agency, because of invisibility capable of presence and potency everywhere, moving on hearts and consciences at the same time in all quarters of the globe.

The bodily disappearance of CHRIST from the earth involves His redemptive character and work in no general disappointment, no inglorious and abrupt failure. In fact, that does but make way for and completes itself in the descent of the HOLY GHOST, the third person of the adorable Trinity, and His continuous work on the grandest possible scale, co-terminous with humanity itself.

I take the liberty to append in this connection these grand words of a great Christian thinker and writer, "The great fact of the Créed, the revelation of the Ever Blessed Trinity in the mystery of redemption, completes itself finally in the HOLY GHOST, through whose presence in the world the saving power of Christ's life is carried over to His people. A new region of glory is thus thrown open to the vision of faith, including, as before, a flowing process, whose commencement is here joined at once with its magnificent end. The whole, however, is but a continuation of the one stupendous mystery that goes before. Our faith in the Holy Ghost is not drawn from some other quarter, and then made to range itself as a separate and independent belief, along with our faith in the Incarnation; it grows forth from this as its necessary and only sufficient ground; it can have no value, no reality, in truth, save as it is made to enter our minds in this way. So, too, our faith in CHRIST completes itself legitimately only, in the faith of the HOLY GHOST. A true Christology, involving, as it must, a living sense of the true universal import of CHRIST's life, carries in itself a demand for the extension of its power, in some way, over to the race he came to redeem. The river of life which first opens upon our view in His person must flow over these banks in the end and become a sea of glory filling the whole world. This can be accomplished only through the

living activity of the HOLY GHOST; whose proper personality and work, accordingly, faith is thus brought to apprehend, as the necessary complement, we may say, of what it has previously apprehended as the presence of GOD in CHRIST. We read of GOD'S Spirit as present with a certain kind of action in the world, before CHRIST came; but it will not do to take this as identical at all with the form of His presence in the world since. We are plainly told that the Spirit, as He now works in the Church, could not be given till CHRIST was glorified; the mystery of the Incarnation must complete its course in His person before room could be made for the further revelation of its power in the other form. This accordingly was the great promise for which His disciples were directed to wait, when He left the world; the fulfillment of which, too, as we all know, took place on the day of Pentecost, and laid the foundation of the Christian Church. The article 'I believe in the HOLY GHOST' has regard altogether to this revelation, the entrance of GOD'S Spirit into the process of the world's life as the Spirit of JESUS CHRIST, under such form of existence and action as had no place before, and was just rendered possible only by the new creation brought to pass in His person. To accept the doctrine of the HOLY GHOST as true on other grounds and under a simply abstract form, cannot satisfy at all the sense of the Apostles' Creed. The only faith in the HOLY GHOST it knows is that which is conditioned by faith in the sublime Christology that goes before, and which grows out of this as its cause and ground."\*

All this now must help us to understand and appreciate the real historical character of the Creed. It is pre-eminently personal and historical, not theological, not scientific, not speculative. Here is neither philosophizing nor dogmatizing. The world is full of Systems of Theology, Christian Institutes, Bodies of Divinity. They have their rightful place and office. The training of candidates for the holy ministry could not be

\* The Rev. J. Williamson Nevin, D.D., LL.D., *MERCERSBURG REVIEW*, 1849, pp. 329-330.

thoroughly conducted without them, and years of preparation are necessary for their complete mastery.

A Creed is not for the few, but the many; for the uneducated as for the learned; for the young and old. It presents great truths, but concretely, in the form of personal revelation and historical fact. It goes out from a living centre, and travels along the road of a living career. Facts, not dogmas, are its staple. Like the Gospels, its Christology is its living principle. We name them the Evangelical History. And the name is a true one. A life, a perfectly unique and marvelous life, stands back of these fragmentary biographies. They begin with the same stupendous event, follow mainly the same course to the same tragic end, and issue at last in the same glorious triumph over death and the grave. Nothing in all literature is so thoroughly historical as these sacred narratives. They put before us a real person; and, notwithstanding admitted diversities, only to be expected in such a four-fold presentation, with a marvelous unity in their conception of His character.

As the Gospels, so the Creed is historical. In some simple form it had actual place before them. And it travels the same glorious highway, setting up the same significant milestones. Here is the same emphasis laid on His essential oneness with God in the depths of eternity, His supernatural conception, His true human birth, His oneness with man under the pressure and power of temptation, His demonstrated purity and sinlessness, the reality of His death, and the reality of His resurrection, and finally the glory of His ascension, followed, in due course, by the advent of the HOLY GHOST, and the establishment of the Christian Church, the product of the Pentecostal wonder as it is itself the vital principle and power of all subsequent history. The Creed throughout is simply factual. GOD is a fact, CHRIST is a fact, the HOLY GHOST is a fact, the Christian Church is a fact, sin is a fact, redemption is a fact. This order of events makes the logic of faith. No man is damned for not believing this or that

system of theology. No man can be saved who believes not the Creed *ex animo*. Away with the miserable cant of its being "a burden on the faith which it expresses." They have altogether misconceived it who imagine anything of the kind. In fact, it is an inspiration and spur rather to Christian thought and action in the right direction. The Church militant, like an army, needs such a standard and symbol to rally and inspire its squadrons.

Says an American divine with great force: "Not as we stand on the threshold merely of this sublime and magnificent temple, but only as we pass into the awful bosom of the sanctuary itself, may we ever expect to apprehend, as they are, the forms and proportions of its true interior structure." Says an American writer of genius: "Christian faith is a grand cathedral with divinely pictured windows. Standing without, you see no glory nor can possibly imagine any; standing within, each ray of light reveals a harmony of unspeakable splendor."

#### IV.

### THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE MINISTRY OF TO-DAY.\*

BY REV. A. E. DAHLMAN.

I HAVE stated my subject as the requirements of the ministry of to-day, not in order to make the impression as though these requirements were *essentially* different in our age from those of any other period in the history of the church. Certainly the natural human heart is the same to-day as the Prophet experienced it to be in his time, deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, and requires the same Divine healing power; there is certainly only one remedy for all the evils of our time, the same as for those of any other, and that is the unadulterated gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ; there is only *one* way of salvation for all time and for all classes of mankind, and that is "there is none other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved" but the name Christ Jesus."

The work of the ministry for the conversion of sinners, the edification of believers and the shepherding of the flock of Christ is essentially the same in all ages. And yet it is true that the age in which we live makes other and in a certain sense *higher* demands of the ministry than any other in the history of the church, and the minister, to be an efficient servant of Christ, dare not disregard all these demands. The *contents* of preaching must remain the same for all time, for the truth is the same, and "other foundation can no man lay than that

\* The substance of an address delivered on the occasion of the dedication of the new building of the Mission House, Franklin, Wis., Nov. 14, 1888.



is laid, which is Jesus Christ, the same yesterday and to-day and forever ;" but the *form* in which this gospel truth is presented must vary according to the social, intellectual, moral and spiritual condition of those to whom we minister, and of the different ages in the history of the Church. St. Paul preached in an altogether different way at Athens, from what he did at Jerusalem ; just as the Apostle Peter preached differently to Cornelius and his household, from what he did to the thousands on the day of Pentecost. There is a marked difference between the sermons of Augustine, Tauler and Luther, not merely to be accounted for by the personal differences of the men, but also by the different circumstances and conditions of the times in which they lived. And those very sermons of Luther and Zwingli which swayed the multitudes, which produced such deep and lasting impressions on many and changed the current of their lives, would fall flat if preached to a modern audience. Even the sermons of Spener and Franke in Germany, so fruitful of spiritual blessings to many, or of the more modern evangelical preachers, would prove more or less ineffective if preached to a German American Assembly.

As the form of preaching, so must also the *method* of *Christian and pastoral work* vary according to the different times, conditions and circumstances. We know, for instance, that the respect and reverence shown the ministerial office in former times is not to be found to-day ; that in this age the masses assume a different, a more hostile position over against the church than in times past, that the increased power and influence of the press has not only elevated the standard of general intelligence, but has also vitiated the taste of many and produced a morbid desire for entertainment and gratification, which makes reading or speaking requiring sharp attention and thoughtfulness distasteful, especially as regards religious and spiritual truth ; we know further that the spread of general education has produced much superficial knowledge which vaunts itself and is puffed up, and immature as it is, assumes to pronounce judgment on truths and principles of

which it has scarcely learned the rudiments. These changed conditions of society require different methods of Christian work from those of other times and other lands; the present more than times past requires *direct personal effort with the individual* in the congregation and community, and the *training of professing Christians to become active workers in the church*, if the minister wishes to receive the divine blessing on his labor for the upbuilding of the Kingdom of our Lord. The ministers of the gospel whose great work it is, by the grace of God and His Holy Spirit, to bring men into subjection to the Lord Jesus Christ, should fully realize what the requirements of the ministry are in the age in which, and among the people with whom, they live. Each one must determine for himself what is specially required for successful work in the field in which he is placed; but there are some general requirements of the ministry of to-day, in which none should be found wanting. Let me briefly refer to these.

1. In the first place I mention *a healthy and strong physical constitution*. This requirement, although not the most important, is worthy of special mention. In some quarters there are parents to-day, who believe that the son who is physically weak and ailing is for that reason better adapted for the ministry than for any other calling in life. And there are young men who seem to think that the want of physical robustness and strength is a certain evidence of their divine call to be ministers of the gospel,—as though the life of the minister were one of ease and leisure and his work not such a strain on his physical powers as that of the laborer, the mechanic, the business and professional man. This idea is altogether wrong, and brings serious disappointment to those who believe in it. Want of physical strength and endurance should rather cause the aspirant to the ministry seriously to question *his* call to this service of the Lord.

There is no work or calling in life which so much demands a strong physical constitution and power of endurance as that of the ministry. Physicians of the highest authority tell us

there is no such strain on the nervous system, no such tax on the physical powers in any other department of work, as that of the two or three regular preaching-services weekly, and the continuous and severe study required if the minister is to be efficient; leaving out of consideration calls for special services and the effects on a sympathetic nature of affliction, suffering and the many ills with which he is officially brought in contact, as well as the sore trials and disappointments he is called to pass through as a faithful servant of Christ. And a faithful and diligent German ministry, such as our church in this country needs, must especially be physically strong and healthy. Every German minister knows how economically his time must be divided, and how his powers are taxed, if he is to be faithful to the several duties of his office. As the circumstances are to-day he must be more outside than within his study. Pastoral visitation, funeral and other special services will keep him busy the greater part of the week. Frequently he will have to make up lost time for necessary study and reading by sitting up late at night. In addition to his other duties, he will often be burdened with the management of the secular matters of the congregation.] If he is a home missionary in the country, he will often have several preaching places, will have to brave all kinds of weather and must continually risk such exposure as a frail constitution cannot bear. The minister does not need the brawn and muscle of a prize-fighter, neither the strength of the cartman and stevedore, but he does need a good measure of health and vitality and nerve power, if he is not to break down after a few years of active and faithful service, a hopeless physical wreck. Montaigne, speaking of the work of education each one has to do for himself, says: "Our work is not to train a soul by itself alone, nor a body by itself alone, but to train a *man*, and in man soul and body can never be divided,"—an important truth which the minister of the gospel should ever keep in mind.

2. The second requirement of the ministry I would mention is a *thorough intellectual training*. Too much importance, it

seems to me, cannot easily be attached to this point. Throughout all the churches to-day in all Christian lands, stress is laid on the necessity of an educated ministry. It is a fanatical notion, only held by a few, that learning is a hindrance, and the lack of it a help to the preacher—a notion which finds no support in Scripture or in the experience of the church. It is true the Apostles of Christ were not learned in the learning of the schools, but they had the teaching of the Master and the special illumination and inspiration of the Holy Spirit for the definite mission of announcing "what they had seen with their eyes and heard with their ears concerning the word of life." And even among them the one who in his youth had sat at the feet of the masters of human learning and obtained the best intellectual training of his time, after learning by divine grace "to count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus his Lord," accomplished more for his master than the rest of the Apostles combined. And in all ages of the Church those who were mighty instruments of God's power for the salvation of men, both as teachers in universities and as preachers for the people—as, for instance, the Reformers—were thoroughly educated men and scholars.

For a full performance of the functions of the ministry a thorough mental training is necessary, such as is generally obtained by a comprehensive classical and theological education. The minister is "the servant of the word of God," engaged in the service of the Church. His office is to proclaim, explain, enforce and apply the truths of the word of God according to the wants of those to whom he is called to minister. The divine word is to-day not communicated by immediate inspiration as it was to the Apostles, but is found complete in Holy Scripture. The latter is the fountain from which all must draw who, as ministers of the gospel, desire to witness to Christ. In the Scripture we have an historical revelation, originally given in foreign languages. To draw as we should from the source of truth, we should have a sufficient knowledge of the original languages and of the principles of

interpretation to verify in particular instances our translation and the explanation of the learned commentators we consult, so as not to get God's truth at second hand, but from the fountain-head. The Church of Christ has been studying and searching the divine revelation during these centuries of its existence, and the student of Scripture is not expected to and could not investigate this immense field of truth depending solely on his own powers and resources. He has and needs the aid of the results of the scriptural study of the ages. These results are crystallized as it were in the Confessions of faith of the Churches, and find full expression in the systems of doctrine. What the naturalist has done for the student of natural science, viz., collected the facts and phenomena, and grouped them in well-ordered systems according to certain great principles and truths, the same helpful service the great teachers of the Church render the student of the word of God to-day. They have gathered facts and truths of Scripture into doctrinal systems which are, as it were, well-prepared highways along which the searcher of truth can pursue a successful quest to fuller knowledge. But in order to accomplish this, these doctrinal systems must be known; hence the necessity of the study of dogmatics. But these dogmas and human systems are not our final source of truth. This, from which they must be taken, and which they are only logically to unfold, and with which their conclusions to be reliable must fully agree and by which they must be verified, is the word of God. It is, therefore, necessary for the well-equipped minister, besides his linguistic and dogmatic knowledge, to have a thorough knowledge of the Bible itself, as to form and contents; to be versed in the questions as to the origin, genuineness and canonicity of the several books of sacred Scripture; to study the special purpose, the development of thought, the doctrinal and practical contents of the single books and the doctrinal development throughout the whole of the canon; to have a knowledge of what is now called biblical theology.

The Bible has been a power in the world these eighteen cen-

turies. Both the Church and the world of the present is a product of the past. The Gospel of Christ has manifested its power, has expressed its inner truth and life in the development and history of the Church. Christ the *word* which was in the beginning, was with God and is God, has not only revealed Himself in the Scriptures, but also in the History of His Church, which is His body. The latter revelation is, to a certain extent, the development of the former, and the two complement each other. Hence, we can only understand the history of the Church in the light of holy Scripture, and this history again throws important and valuable light on God's truth for the minister of to-day. For his thorough outfit, therefore, he requires a thorough and extensive knowledge of the history of the Church, and of the world, which is, as it were, the scaffold around the temple of the Kingdom of God. Add to what has been mentioned the study of practical theology and we have the necessary intellectual equipment of the efficient minister of to-day, an equipment which cannot well be obtained without a thorough classical and literary course of study preparatory to it.

But, it may be objected, have we not ministers at the present day without a classical and with a very limited theological education who are, nevertheless, successful in their work, have organized and built up large congregations, and, what is more, whose labor of love is fruitful of spiritual results, and whose ministration God has signally blessed for the conversion of souls? Is, therefore, not a facility of utterance, a good command of English or German and a common school education, joined with knowledge of the Bible, with natural gifts and good common sense, and especially a truly regenerated heart, sufficient to insure usefulness in the ministry? Far be it from me to advocate the exclusion of such from the ministry, simply because they have no higher literary and theological attainments. Nay, whomsoever God has truly called man has no right to exclude. Besides, the present state of the Church and of home missionary-work is such that we would be very

unwise if we would not welcome such men to the ranks of the ministry. And yet the fact remains that those successful and efficient in the ministry, whose education was deficient, are the *exceptions* and not the *rule*; and many such admitted by Church courts to licensure and ordination have proved dead failures, have brought disgrace to the Church to which they belonged and incalculable harm to the congregations they served. We must also not forget that those who are efficient in their places generally have special talents and an untiring energy which they put to the work of supplying the wants of their education during their ministerial career as best they can,—talents which, if they had enjoyed the opportunities of their brethren, would have placed them in the front ranks of their fellows and increased their usefulness manifold. These successful ministerial brethren are not of the kind to boast of their want of education; on the contrary, they tell you that the longer they are in the work and the more they are conscious of its opportunities and requirements, the more painfully they feel their deficiencies; and if they have sons who choose the ministry, they will be very careful to give them all the opportunities of a thorough education in their power.

We must certainly not lower the standard of education of the ministry at the present day. Our age is a reading and a thinking age; our people are restlessly active; notwithstanding its defects, popular education is becoming more general and information on important subjects wider, from year to year. We, in our Church, need a thoroughly educated ministry, if we want to gather in the better educated of our German population and hold our own youth who have enjoyed and used the opportunities of higher culture. Yes, even if we would have merely a hearing in some of our cities, we need thorough, intellectual training. So much more do we need it if we want to be reliable expounders and teachers of the Divine Word in whom our people are to place implicit confidence. If a minister does not, as a general thing, stand above the average intelligence of the community where he dwells, he will not have the



respect of his people. "The Christian pastor to-day," says one of our most eminent divines, "for a successful discharge of his duties, will need the highest discipline of mind and heart of which he is capable, and the amplest resources of knowledge he can possibly accumulate. He is to occupy a position of responsibility, that is second to none on earth. Every day, if true to his trust, he not only moulds characters that are to endure forever, but there goes forth from him and his Church a power that enters as an integral part into the life of the nation. No man should be willing or be permitted to take such a position, who has not made of himself, intellectually and morally, the utmost that his natural endowments and the providence of God have permitted, and has not thereby been made able to teach men."

It has sometimes been said that a good scholar will not make a practical preacher of the gospel; but the fault in such cases lies not with the scholarship, but with the peculiarity of the man. We have many instances of far-reaching and thorough scholarship joined with the greatest practical efficiency and success in the ministry; and not only in the case of the Reformers, of Wesley, of Tholuck and of Krummacher, but of some of the most eminent preachers of our time.

We must not forget that thorough intellectual training is not to be attained by learning to know a little of everything and spreading one's self over a great deal of ground. On the contrary, the few necessary and important branches, thoroughly mastered by hard and continuous study, will sooner furnish the intellectual training required to-day than a pretentious all-embracing course of study that only superficially touches each subject prescribed. But such training is never obtained by a short, hot-bed process sometimes resorted to. Some who have not the perseverance needed to acquire a liberal education, some who are engaged early and are in a hurry to get married, like to have a short-cut to the ministry. And unfortunately, the great number of vacant charges often moves Church-courts and trustee-boards and faculties of theological institutions to

hurry students through the course and into the active ministry, who should have been more thoroughly furnished for their work. A want of thorough intellectual training is a misfortune that will be deplored by every minister conscious of it and by the denomination to which he belongs.

8. A third requirement of the ministry, one of paramount importance, is a *true and living faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and a heart renewed by the Spirit of God*. The minister is to teach the way of salvation; but as little can the blind lead the blind as an unconverted minister can lead sinful man to the Saviour and be a help to the believing Christian for sanctification of heart and life. The minister is to be a witness, not merely to the historical but to the *living* Christ. This is impossible unless Christ lives in him, and he in Christ. How can he testify to the saving love and power of the Lord, unless he can say with the Apostle: "I know whom I have believed"? The man who is not called of God to the ministry, who has not heard the voice of the Divine Spirit speaking in his heart and felt His influence drawing him to this most noble and glorious, but also most responsible of all callings, has committed a most serious mistake by entering the ministry, and the best he can do for his welfare and that of others is to retire from it to choose any, though it be the humblest, secular calling. A minister not divinely called to this high and holy office is a hindrance to the cause of Christ, a stumbling-block to immortal souls and adds to the burden of his personal guilt that for the destruction of others. Now, although the possession of intellectual gifts and of health, the encouragement of friends, the Providential removal of hindrances to entering the ministry, may be considered as evidences of a divine call, yet all these amount to nothing if the *one principal evidence* is wanting: that of a truly converted and regenerated heart. A man may have a mind well stocked with knowledge, he may have a thorough intellectual outfit for the ministry, he may be a man of energy and ambition, and yet accomplish little or nothing for Christ. His sermons are lifeless dissertations, and go far above the heads

of the people; his influence is small; he may have the reputation of being a very learned man, but the hearts of the people are not drawn towards him; his congregation grows more indifferent and languishing the longer he remains. On the other hand, we find a man of slender 'gifts and accomplishments, compared with those of the first, gathering around him a growing congregation; we hear of spiritual blessings from his ministrations, and see how he is a power for good among his people. What accounts for the different results of the ministry of these two men, or classes of men? The one is a *learned* man, but that is all. His religion is a concept of his mind, a logical system of thought, but he was never bowed down under the burden of his *own* sin; that cry for mercy, coming from a heart most deeply humiliated by realizing its sinfulness and misery, and rising up to heaven and into the heart of God, never came from him. That peace of God which passeth knowledge, received by casting away the filthy rags of our self-righteousness, and with humble and believing hearts appropriating the righteousness of our Lord Christ to ourselves, does not dwell in his heart. The *other*, however, knows the living Christ, himself plucked as a brand from the burning, and with a heart all ablaze with the blessed Redeemer's love, with slight gifts and acquirements, he is employed as an instrument of divine power and blessing.

The minister of the gospel, unless he is a truly regenerated man, will not and cannot be a safe teacher of the divine word. For all the knowledge of the languages of the Bible, of the principle of its interpretation, of the history and doctrine of the Church of Christ, will after all, even if he is a man of the most studious habits, leave him in the dark as to the true meaning of the sacred text, unless his soul is also illumined by the Holy Spirit of God, who alone leadeth into all truth. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing, the words I speak unto you, they are *spirit* and they are *life*." We have the example of some learned commentators carefully analyzing and explaining the external shell of the truth, but not

reaching the kernel ; sometimes by ingenious explanations and methods seeking so far away for the simple truth full of comfort and power, which lies so near. No man without depending on his learning, will heartily seek the illumination of the Spirit for the right understanding of the divine word, in earnest and constant prayer, unless he has learned to know his proud and wayward heart and to realize that it is *God* who worketh in us to will and to do of His good pleasure.

This has been the want of the church at all times—men for the ministry full of faith and the Holy Ghost. Especially is this want felt in an age like ours, when there is danger that a mistaken notion of gaining worldly emoluments and honor, and of an easy and agreeable life, in which there is leisure for the indulgence of literary and scientific tastes, draws many into the sacred ministry. Our time demands men whose hearts are in the work, and who are proof against the temptations to a life of ease, a sounding reputation by preaching to amuse and entertain the hearers and of the spirit of worldliness so frequently hidden at present under the garb of piety. And they alone will prove themselves loyal to Christ, amid the subtle temptations and the sore trials and disappointments our age brings to the faithful follower of the Lord in the ministry, who, having heartily forsaken sin and the world, find their all and in all in Christ Jesus.

We must not forget that we as ministers are not only to preach by our words, but also by our lives. *We*, especially, are to be living epistles seen and read by all. We are to demonstrate the saving power of the gospel by our walk and conversation. And the world as well as the church expects this of the heralds of the cross. Not only our words but our actions are very thoroughly sifted. From a thousand points the searching eye of the world is upon us, doing its utmost to discover some flaw or inconsistency in our character and life. Are those words of *terrible import* to the professing Christian in general, "offenses will surely come, but woe unto him by whom they come," how much more so are they to the minister of the

gospel! We may preach sound doctrine, but if our life does not manifest the stamp and impress of the Lord Christ, our hearers will be prejudiced against the truth, and our efforts will be futile. Only the life of him will pattern after Christ, in whose heart the Lord Jesus occupies the throne.

Ours is the age in which the spirit of doubt and unbelief boldly attacks the citadel of truth. These attacks come not only from infidel science and philosophy. They come from *within* the church, from those specially appointed to be the teachers and defenders of the truth. The tendency of most of the so-called higher criticism is to undermine the authority of the written word. The effort is making to show that the greater part of the Old Testament scripture is merely human composition, and the object of these higher critics is evidently to eliminate the element of inspiration from the whole Bible, and present it to the world and church at the end of this enlightened nineteenth century, not as *God's* but merely as *man's* book. The thoroughly educated minister of the gospel should not entirely ignore these discussions about the genuineness and authorship and time of composition of the biblical writings; he should follow the trend of theological investigation, as much as his other duties permit. He should be posted in the methods of a science and philosophy hostile to Christianity. The more full and thorough his education, the greater not only his inclination but his duty in this respect. He must be armed against these attacks, for he will be called upon to meet them in some way or other. If at such times he betrays his ignorance, he brings disgrace on the truth of the gospel, and on the cause of Christ. Now it is certain that many questions arise, which he will not be able to answer, many problems he cannot solve. *No earnest seeker of truth has been spared the severest mental conflicts.* There is certainly danger of drifting from safe moorings into the stormy and dangerous sea of unbelief, if his faith is principally a conception of the mind, and a well-ordered system of thought, but *never* if his heart is anchored to the Rock of Ages, and his life hid

*with Christ in God.* Over against all attacks from without and questionings from within, such a one will receive strength to stand firm in the full assurance of a "*thus saith the Lord.*"

4. Another important requirement for the efficient minister is *the spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion to the Master.* We know there were times in the history of the church when the believer, and especially the minister of the Word, was called literally to forsake all, houses and lands and possessions, standing and good reputation, wife and children, home and country, in short, everything that was dear to him in this life, and follow Christ. I am not saying too much by affirming that although such *literal* sacrifices are not now required, yet the age in which we live calls for that same spirit of devotion to the Master which prompted His disciples in by-gone days. As in times of peace and prosperity the worldly spirit entered the church and affected its vitality, so the favorable circumstances of the present are full of temptations to unfaithfulness for the servant of the Word. He that is favored with a good salary and an agreeable living, will he not be sorely tempted to retain his position and his hold upon his people even at the cost of his fidelity to the truth? If he wishes to be faithful to the duties of his office, his chief concern as to his preaching and pastoral work must be, not What will my people like to have? but What is the will of my Heavenly Master? not How can I retain their good will? but how can I further the glory of God? The earnest endeavor to have a conscience void of offense before God and man will lead him to present the *whole* truth (not leaving out that part of it which is unpalatable to the natural human heart), to rebuke all forms of sin in public and private and to exercise the needed discipline. Such faithful work on his part will inevitably stir up opposition. He will find at times that his hearers and friends forsake him, and that if he continues in this way, the injury, perchance destruction, of his reputation, and ensuing reproach and poverty stare him in the face. When he is forewarned of these things, and the influential rich minority who give social position to the congregation

and pay the bills, give him to understand that he is making a mistake, that he must not be so outspoken, that the congregation is suffering through him, and the tempter, pointing to his family and doubtful future, slyly hints that by changing the tone of his preaching a little he can draw crowds, and by yielding a point here and there for the sake of peace, he will not take a wrong course, but rather strengthen his position and regain his old friends, who will say that *then* the faithful minister must not pass through the *fires of temptation*? Only *one thing* will help him to preserve his integrity, and come out of the fiery test in safety, and that is the true loyalty and devotion of love to Him who has first loved us and given Himself for us. And without this spirit of self-sacrifice, his ministry will be a failure (it is true not always in the sight of men, for the worldly wise, who seeks human applause and selfish ends, often enjoys *external* success and human praise); but before Him, who will weigh us and our work, who will burn the chaff and bring unfaithfulness to judgment. If we are not prompted by love to Jesus and willing to spend and be spent in His service, we had better keep out of the ministry or leave it if in its ranks. The ministry is a life of toil; it demands willing and joyful submission to God; for the amount and quality of its work, it brings no remuneration in dollars and cents as professional or business or mechanical labor; it often leaves us destitute when incapacitated by sickness and age; it leaves our families unprovided for when called away in the middle of life; it often disappoints our expectations and brings trials and griefs which oppress us by day and rob us of sleep by night. Who is it that will *not* rue his choice of such a calling, but rejoice even in its trials? He alone who has by divine grace offered himself a living sacrifice well pleasing in the sight of God.

5. The last requirement of the ministry to-day, to which I refer, is a *love for souls*. The apostle had a consuming love for his fellow-men, a burning desire for their eternal welfare. The glory of his Master and the salvation of his fellow-beings,—these were the two great purposes of the thought and work,



conflict and suffering of his life. Be ye my followers as I am a follower of Christ, is his admonition especially to the ministers of the Word. This burning desire for the salvation of souls is the secret of the success of all in all times, whose ministry the Lord has honored with His blessing and outpourings of His Spirit. The minister must see in every person he meets, whether high or low, respectable or degraded, an immortal soul for whom Christ died, having before it an eternity of blessedness or of unspeakable misery, according to the use it makes of the proffered means of grace; and his heart must *yearn* for its deliverance and salvation from impending doom. He should have the desire to gather every one, with whom he comes in contact, into the fold of Christ as a reward of the sufferings of his Redeemer. Where this desire and love is in the heart, it will shine forth from the countenance, it will be heard out of the words, it will involuntarily make itself felt and open an avenue to the heart, whether in preaching or in conversation. There are ministers to-day who preach the gospel truths of sin and grace in clear and simple style; their preaching is personal and direct, even in common-place language, without any oratorical display; and yet they gather around their pulpit from Sunday to Sunday congregations of all classes of society, which fill their spacious churches. The secret of their success is their *heartfelt sympathy* with their fellow-men and *love of their souls*. They say nothing of it, are not demonstrative of it and yet their hearers feel it as a warm glow spread over their sermons and prayers and carrying warmth and light to their bosoms. This desire for the salvation of souls, indispensable as it is in any age, is especially required in our time. To-day the masses are estranged from the church and prejudiced against it more than in previous times. The golden calf, dress, pleasure, lust and the like, are the gods whom they serve. Lawlessness, immorality and vice, the hand-maids of unbelief, are making serious inroads into certain classes of our population. Is the church to look on quietly, when masses of those who were once its children forsake it, when these masses pursue the

highway of destruction to themselves and of serious danger to the nation? No; if men will not go to the church to hear the gospel, the gospel must be brought to them; and if they seem callous to its truths and blessings, the church must use all proper means in its power to win their hearts, even proving to them its genuine desire for their welfare by bringing them needed temporal succor as much as it can. The minister must take the lead in this work. He must endeavor, by *personal effort with the individual*, to win the indifferent and worldly and those who have proved unfaithful to their sacramental vows back into the fold. *If the love of Christ and of souls* constrains him, and *only* then, he will find the *right tone* and *tact* in dealing with such and prove untiring and self-sacrificing in his efforts, the *necessary* condition of success. But he will not be able to accomplish much alone, or without the aid of the believing Christians of his congregation. These he must be able to influence and educate to personal Christian work, to bring their friends and acquaintances, and the indifferent in general, into contact with the gospel, and aid him in winning their souls. And it is only the heart full of love and sympathy and the pastor's own personal example that can enlist others in this work.

The ministry is not a profession, but a *vocation*, and it is a mighty instrument of God's power to-day in this land for the salvation of many and the good of the nation—a vocation calling for the most thorough training of the mind, and, what is more, for the highest education of the heart, such as is only obtained in the school of the Holy Ghost.

## V.

### RESULTS AND AIMS OF NATURAL PHILOSOPHY.

BY PROF. R. C. SCHIEDT.

THE religious problems and religious thought of the present age are so intimately connected with the processes of scientific and philosophic investigation that we may be pardoned for presenting to the readers of a theological periodical a series of treatises on purely scientific topics. It is our aim to reproduce in popular language what the leading minds of our time call the burning questions in the sphere of scientific research. In a previous number we endeavored to explain the principles of modern chemistry. Closely related to this branch of natural sciences is what is generally called Natural Philosophy. The atomic theory can only be fully established and understood on the basis of the principle of the greatest development of heat, or, the leading principle of chemistry has to be complemented by that of Natural Philosophy. The theme before us is, however, so comprehensive that it is entirely impossible here to go into details, and the treatment will necessarily be more or less subjective since a number of valuable scientific investigations which are somewhat foreign to the leading aims of the present day, have to be omitted. However, in order to be as objective as possible, we mention only such men whose chief works have already become authorities and are generally recognized as such.

#### I.

The general aim of natural sciences is to-day the same as it was centuries ago; we are intensely interested in learning to know and to understand nature. The aim of Natural Philosophy or Physics in particular is concentrated upon the study of

those phenomena which exclude chemical changes. Such a study confines itself to the endeavor to reduce the different phenomena to as few as possible fundamental facts and hypotheses which form their final basis. From these fundamental principles the sum and substance of all the phenomena is deduced by strict analysis and synthesis. Thus Newton's discovery of the law of gravitation was one of the most important steps in the progress made towards a more perfect understanding of nature; for many phenomena apparently disconnected, as for instance the movements of planets and moons and the fall of bodies on the surface of the earth, the old puzzle of ebb and flood, the deviation of the plumb line in the neighborhood of great mountain ranges, became then known as being simply different manifestations of one and the same fundamental power: gravitation. This power itself has not yet been further explained; it still remains an ultimate fundamental fact.

But, whilst on the one side the progress of science limits the unknown treasures of nature, on the other side ever new problems arise through the discovery of new facts. Every age has its own particular problems which absorb the attention of all energetic students and demand a solution from the scientific circles of the times; the general aim, however, remains always the same.

In order to understand the present results of the study of natural philosophy it will be necessary to reiterate briefly its past stages of development; only a knowledge of the past enables us to understand rightly the present. At the beginning of our century natural philosophy consisted of a number of disconnected parts; the books generally contained first the purely mechanical theorems, including acoustics, followed by a few disconnected chapters treating on the phenomena of light, heat, magnetism and electricity. These groups of phenomena were explained by assuming the existence of certain fluids which, having no sensible weight, were not subject to the law of gravitation; they were therefore called *imponderables*. According to the old theory a flame gave light because it emitted particles of light; a body became warm through the recep-

tion of heat-matter ; the phenomena of magnetism and electricity were due to two magnetic and two electric fluids. Thus, nature seemed to be composed of ponderable matter with six imponderables, or matter destitute of weight.

This childish way of explaining nature has since been superseded step by step by a riper and deeper conception. During the third decade of this century the theory of the emission of light, upheld for many years by Newton's authority, was finally replaced by the theory of undulation or wave theory which Thomas Young, Fresnel and F. Neumann fully established after it had been most excellently introduced by Huygens almost one hundred and fifty years previous. According to this theory, the propagation of the radiation of light must be conceived as being the undulation of a transparent medium which fills the world, called luminiferous ether. The waves are propagated through the ether at the rate of 185,600 miles per second. The hypothesis of an ether had been maintained by different speculators for different reasons. To Descartes, who made extension the sole essential property of matter, the bare existence of bodies apparently at a distance was a proof of the existence of a continuous medium between them. But besides these high metaphysical necessities for a medium there were more empirical uses to be fulfilled by ethers. Ethers were invented for all possible sensations and motions until all space had been filled three or four times over with ether. Newton endeavored to account for gravitation by differences of pressure in an ether, but he did not publish his theory, "because he was not able from experiment and observation to give a satisfactory account of this medium and the manner of its operation in producing the chief phenomena of nature." The only ether which has survived is that which was accepted by Huygens to explain the propagation of light. The evidence for the existence of this ether has accumulated since additional phenomena of light and other radiations have been discovered. As a necessary conclusion also, heat-radiation was found to be an undulation of this medium ; for all the characteristic properties

of the rays of light, which could only be satisfactorily explained on the basis of the theory of undulation—their reflection, refraction, polarization, diffraction, interference—must also be ascribed to invisible rays of heat. That overthrew the old theory according to which a body had to receive heat-matter in order to be heated (caloric theory); it was now established that heat is the product of the undulation of ether which causes a stronger vibration of the particles of the body, a phenomenon which is invisible to the eye as much as the smallest particles themselves.

Besides, other considerations of far more important consequences led to the same conclusions of the non-existence of heat-matter. From the dawn of science till the close of the last century two rival hypotheses had been entertained regarding the nature of heat, each more or less plausible, but neither on any sure experimental basis. The one already mentioned, that heat consists of a subtile elastic fluid permeating the interstices between the particles of matter like water in a sponge, the other, that it is an intestine commotion among the particles or molecules of matter. Davy and Rumford at the end of last century conclusively overthrew the former of these hypotheses, and Davy gave good reason for accepting the latter as true by his celebrated experiment of converting ice into water by rubbing two pieces of ice together without communicating any heat from surrounding matter. But both were at fault in still considering heat a material substance. Fifty years elapsed before the scientific world became converted to their conclusions and began to advance beyond their views. Daily experience confirmed the statements that heat can be generated by a certain amount of mechanical work, *e. g.*, by friction; yes, even that perpetual friction will generate perpetual heat. On the other hand, it was shown by the example of the steam-engine that it is possible to obtain work from heat and that the larger the requisite quantity of work, the larger must be the generated quantity of heat. These considerations developed the idea of a definite relation between the amount of work done

and that of generated heat as well as that of consumed heat and produced work. One of the first who undertook this determination of the mechanical equivalent of heat was Séguin, a nephew of Montgolfier. He argued that if heat be energy, or work capacity, some of it must be consumed in the operation if it is employed in doing work. Hence he inferred "that the amount of heat given up to the condenser of an engine, when the engine is doing work, must be less than when the same amount of steam is blown through the engine without doing work." Séguin was unable to verify this experimentally, but in 1857 Hirn succeeded not only in showing that such a difference exists, but also in measuring it and hence determining a tolerably approximate value of the mechanical equivalent of heat. The foremost, however, who first clearly and distinctly developed the idea of the equivalence of heat and energy was Jul. Rob. Mayer, a physician at Heilbronn. In 1842 he made an assumption the converse of that of Séguin, asserting that the whole of the work done in compressing the air was converted into heat; he gave at the same time, and on the basis of existing data, the numerical definition of the chemical equivalent of heat. But he overlooked the possibility of heat being consumed in doing work within the air itself, or being produced by the transformation of internal potential energy. Dr. Joule, of Manchester, afterwards proved that Dr. Mayer's assumption was in accordance with fact; he corrected his oversight by performing the same experiments with different atmospheric pressures, and established thus the exact numerical value of the mechanical equivalent of heat. The result of this final investigation is 772.43 Manchester foot-pounds for the quantity of heat required to warm from  $60^{\circ}$  to  $61^{\circ}$  Fahrenheit a pound of water weighed in a vacuum. The true nature of heat was now defined not as a fluid, indeed, but as a force belonging to the species of mechanical energy; it is in all probability nothing but molecular motion.

The speculations which had thus resulted in establishing the mechanical theory of heat were at once very extensively gen-



eralized. [Clausius and Clerk Maxwell have since given us thermal conductivities of air and other gases, based on their splendid development of the above theory. We know that the thermal conductivity of iron, *e. g.*, is 80 times and that of copper 500 times that of water.] The loss of work through frictionless resistance is only apparent; it is actually and undiminished present in the equivalent amount of generated heat. It can likewise be proved in all cases where work has been accomplished that the original quantity of energy has not been lost, but that its full amount is present in the results of work, *i. e.*, that only the form of the original quantity of energy has undergone a change. If, for instance, the electric current of a dynamo-electric machine, driven by steam-power, causes an incandescent lamp to give forth light, mechanical work has been transformed through this medium into heat, which partly appears throughout the whole conducting wire and partly heats the thin filament of carbon in the glass vacuum bulb to self-ignition. But, if the same electric current is conducted into a second dynamo-electric machine, causing its ring armature to revolve, *i. e.* to perform a certain work, then only a part of the originally-produced mechanical work has been consumed to heat the conducting wire, the other part reappears in the original form, only at another place. Just as a quantity of energy never disappears without an equivalent generation of energy, so no generation of energy takes place without an equivalent consumption of energy.

In the light of this fact all changes in nature are now recognized as interchanges of the forms of energy. *The quantity of cosmic energy is constant; energy can neither be created nor destroyed.* This principle of the conservation of energy is of fundamental importance; it forms one of the two chief pillars of the exact natural sciences. The other is the analogous principle: *The quantity of cosmic matter is constant; matter can neither be created nor destroyed.*

## II.

The principle of the conservation of energy, which in its totality was first recognized and expressed by v. Helmholtz, is to-day the chief guide in all physical investigation; it is the bond which most intimately connects the different chapters of natural philosophy and brings phenomena which appear at first sight widely separated, into closest relationship; it has moulded modern physics, which it rules so completely that physics has been defined as the science of the different forms of energy and their reciprocal transmutations. *To follow out this principle in all its consequences is the aim of a great number of investigations of the present time.* These investigations are, however, by no means confined to natural philosophy proper; chemistry, physiology, meteorology and astronomy have each their share in them. We mention a few points of contact. Inquiries are made into the relation of the electro-motive power of a galvanic battery to the heat-balance of the chemical reactions going on in it. The thermo-dynamics of chemical processes are very generally studied. The principle is likewise employed in determining the changes of temperature manifested in ascending and descending air-currents, which explains the origin of the hot wind (Foehn) that rushes from the icy crests of the Alps down into the valleys. It even helps to determine the constitution of gaseous cosmic bodies.

The relation of all natural forces and their equivalence to mechanical magnitudes suggests the possibility of proving that the different units of measurement generally used in the different departments of natural philosophy (thermal, magnetic, electric, etc.) are interrelated, and that finally all physical magnitudes can be measured by the same mechanical fundamental units. The introduction of this *absolute system of measurements*, indicating a great scientific progress over against the relative system of measurements, is to be ascribed to the brilliant mathematician, astronomer and physicist, C. F. Gauss, for it was he who taught us to measure the magnetic magnitudes by

the units of space, mass and time. In the earlier stages of the science several units were introduced for the measurement of quantities dealt with in electricity. As examples of these, we may mention the wire of Jacobi and the mercury column of Siemens, a metre long, with a section of a square millimetre, which at given temperatures furnished units of resistance; the Daniell's cell, which furnished the unit of electromotive force; the chemical unit of current intensity, etc. All these units were perfectly arbitrary and there was no connection of any kind between them. In conjunction with Weber, Gauss introduced his principles into the measurement of the earth's magnetic force. To Weber belongs the credit of doing similar service to electricity. He not only devised three different systems of such units—the electro-dynamical, the electrostatic and the electro-magnetic—but he carried out a series of measurements which practically introduced the last two systems. The fundamental research in this subject is to determine in electro-magnetic measure the resistance of some wire from which, by comparison, the electro-magnetic unit of resistance can be constructed. This led to the general introduction of absolute measurement. Centimetre, gramme and second are the units which, according to the conclusions of the international congress of electricians assembled at Paris, in 1881, are the basis of all physical measurement. According to the centimetre-gramme-second system of units, as it is called, the absolute unit of force produces in one second in a mass of one gramme a velocity of one centimetre per second.

Further, the knowledge of the true character of heat has been effective in a quite different direction, in bringing the study of *molecular physics*, a very extensive and unexplored territory, into the foreground of investigation. If heat is to be considered as molecular motion—i. e., as the motion of those particles which constitute bodies—then the question must follow what kind of motion this may be: a question which is most intimately connected with inquiries into the internal constituents of bodies and into the molecular forces. *The solution of these*

*fundamental problems of molecular physics constitutes a second high aim of the present scientific research.*

Of course there is no hope that we will ever be enabled to see the single molecules and to follow immediately their motions, for the investigations of Abbe in Jena and v. Helmholtz in Berlin have proved that there is but very little room left for any further improvements on the construction of our microscopes; there is no more beyond, as far as their working ability is concerned. But shall we therefore despair and give up the solution of these problems? Have we already reached the limit of human knowledge?

No! Such a resignation could only be forced upon us if our means of research were confined to the bodily eye. But our spiritual eye allows us to penetrate into a far greater depth. Here it is where the play of imagination and speculation begins, of which the naturalist has just as great a need as any other seeker after truth. Of course his imagination dare not become a wild fancy; it must be governed step by step by reason and experience.

It should be possible, by establishing very simple hypotheses relating to the internal condition of bodies and the character of molecular motion, to give full explanation of all the properties of bodies in their totality, even to predict new, hitherto unknown facts; such hypotheses should be accepted as at least very probable. In order to establish them as indisputable truth, it would of course be necessary to prove that they are the only possible suppositions. It cannot be avoided that many a hypothesis will not stand the test, but must be laid aside as useless lumber. However, it will not be without benefit, for every conclusion drawn from it and tested by experiment has contributed to the extension or correction of natural science.

Among the different bodies the gaseous are to be mentioned primarily as such whose chief constituents have been thoroughly investigated. The kinetic theory of gases, also called the theory of molecular forces, had been already established, at

least in its fundamental features, in the last century by Daniel Bernoulli, but was afterwards entirely forgotten; it was renewed in our century almost simultaneously by three physicists, Krönig, Joule and Clausius, and especially developed by the last-named and Clerk Maxwell. According to this theory, a given quantity of air or any other gas is not to be considered as one compact, undivided mass, but as a complex of particles in motion resembling a mosquito swarm. The single particles follow the straight line of motion until they impinge upon each other or touch the wall of the vessel and are repelled. This hypothesis, which explains to our surprise all the chief properties of the gases and which also allows us to compute the velocity of the single particles, the mean length of the interval between the two collisions, yes, even the absolute size of the single molecules, is continuously calling forth new inquiries, *e. g.*, into the internal friction or viscosity of gases, their heat-conductivity, the transpiration (diffusion), and free expansion of different gases. Such investigations have been undertaken experimentally by Graham, Loschmidt, Clerk Maxwell, O. E. Meyer and others. Yet the hypothesis cannot be considered as completely established.

Remarkable observations made by Andrews (1871), as well as the older but less-esteemed experiments of Caignard de la Tour (1822), refer to the existence of so intimate a connection between the gaseous and the liquid aggregation that the theory of gases must necessarily apply to that of liquids. Andrews called this property of gases and liquids the critical condition of matter. There is a temperature common to all gases, above which they cannot be condensed—that is, the critical temperature. Again, Caignard de la Tour showed that all liquids, when heated above a certain temperature (the same critical temperature), would be transformed into gases (absolute boiling point of Mendelyeff), although they were subject to intense pressure (in closed tubes). The pressure exerted by the gas at the critical temperature, at which it would immediately condense upon lowering the temperature, is called the critical pressure;

the volume filled by the substance at this time is called the critical volume. An explanation of the existence of the critical condition is afforded by the consideration that at the critical temperature and pressure the volume of the gas is equal to the volume of an equal quantity by weight of the liquid; there exists no longer a difference between the gaseous and liquid condition. Yet the transition from one condition into the other is not at any moment perceptible. If we therefore accept the kinetic theory for the internal condition of gases, we must do essentially the same with liquids, granting that in the latter case there is almost no interval between two collisions. The fact that a still, standing liquid is truly "still and moving" seems to be verified by the so-called "Brown's molecular motions,"—those peculiarly oscillating motions which betray under the microscope small particles hanging in the liquid.

Just as the liquid condition is related on the one side to the gaseous, so it is on the other side to the solid. Most of the solid bodies show the same characteristics under high pressure as the liquids under normal pressure—*i.e.*, they can be converted without destroying the connection of the parts. The molecules, however, are displaced, losing their original equilibrium, around which they or their atoms, in their normal condition, perform rotary motions, determinating thus the heat status of the whole body. In other cases of later investigation the displacement of the molecules is infinitely small, yielding to the continued influence of moderate forces, after whose removal they slowly return again. This elastic after-effect seems to promise, to further research, a still deeper insight into the nature of solid bodies.

But now the question arises: Which spacial arrangement must be assigned to the equilibrium of the constituent particles of a solid body? As far as the problem touches crystallized bodies representing the greatest number of solid bodies, its solution was successfully begun at the end of the last century by Torbern Bergmann, and especially by Haüy, who discovered the geometrical law of crystallization, according to which crystals are composed of what he called "integrant molecules,"

built upon layers around a nucleus, each layer diminishing regularly in the number of rows of molecules, and the rows at the same time diminishing regularly in the number of molecules, according to the nature of the crystal. Their ideas were further developed later on by Frankenheim, Bravais and others. In modern times, far more definite and at the same time more general data have been gained with regard to the structure of crystallized bodies, upon the basis of the simple reflection that in such bodies the arrangement of particles must, in the nature of the case, be regular. They are regularly grouped, according to directions of varying density and coherence, which find expression in the cleavage and the thermal and optical behaviour of bodies. A consequence of this regular arrangement is, in the case of undisturbed formation, the external limitation of bodies by planes, edges and angles, which represent the crystal form. But here we cannot dwell more definitely on the subject.

Whilst thus we already possess some insight into the internal condition of the different bodies, we must acknowledge that the law of molecular forces is still a mystery. A few conclusions have been drawn, especially upon the basis of the capillary phenomena, as represented by the liquids, relating, however, only to the extent of the indefinitely small sphere of these forces.

To the realm of molecular physics belongs finally also the dispersion of colors, caused by the reflection of light; for it chiefly depends upon the material structure of the bodies, certain anomalies of which seem to be connected with the simultaneous absorption of light, and that is conditioned by the nature of the molecules which are struck by the waves of light.

But there exists between absorption and emission an intimate connection, which has been very accurately expressed by Kirchhoff's proposition, that there exists, at constant temperature, in all bodies, the same relation between the capacity of emission and absorption for light of the same wave length. Thus we pass on from molecular physics to the spectrum analysis, that wonderful discovery, which enables us to recognize, through the examination of the emitted or absorbed light, the chemical na-



ture of the emitting or absorbing body—nay, which has even established the chemistry of the heavenly bodies, a science whose mere possibility formerly even the keenest imagination could scarcely anticipate. The investigation of the sun's spectrum has cleared up most of the changes occurring there, and this has led to a complete sun meteorology. All the fixed stars thus far investigated possess a constitution like that of the sun. A gas has been discovered near the sun, which is said to be still simpler than hydrogen, which, if fully established, might cause a complete revolution in chemistry. Yet, however much has been accomplished in the realm of spectral analysis by their founders, Kirchhoff and Bunsen, as well as by the great number of their successors, much more is still left to be done. *Thus we recognize that improved investigations by spectrum analysis are a further problem of modern physics—a problem which, however, belongs with equal right to its sister science, chemistry.*

### III.

We have shown above how one of the six imponderable fluids, heat matter, has been removed through the progress of science. Let us ascertain the fate of the others. At about the same time when the theory of heat-matter was abandoned, Ampère proved that the hypothesis of the two magnetic fluids were likewise superfluous. An electric current affects both another electric current (pondero-motive action) and the magnetic needle in the same way as certain magnetic masses, whose arrangement and number can be exactly defined in every single case; conversely, every given magnet can be substituted by an electric current of such character that their effect is identical with that of the magnet. Upon this substitution rests the theory of Ampère, who was preceded by the preliminary experiments of Oerstedt. It is known that even the smallest fragment of a magnet is itself a perfect magnet having two poles, and that therefore the whole magnet has to be regarded as being built up of a number of elementary magnets. Whilst

formerly, according to the older theory, every elementary magnet was considered as having the two magnetic fluids, containing in its north pole north magnetic fluid, and in its south pole the same quantity of south magnetic fluid, now these two fluids have become superfluous, because, according to Ampère's theory, every elementary particle of the magnet is now thought to be surrounded by an electric current whose motion continues without resistance and therefore just as persistently as the rotation of the earth around the sun. (Physicists had long been looking for the connection between magnetism and electricity, and had perhaps inclined to the view that electricity was somehow to be explained as a magnetic phenomenon. Ampère showed that the explanation was to be found in an opposite direction. Faraday's discovery excepted, there is no advance in the science of electricity that can compare for completeness and brilliancy with the work of Ampère.)

Thus we see at once two more imponderables removed and the original number (six) reduced to three. Besides the ether of light we have still the two electric fluids which are distinguished as positive and negative electricity. But they seem to live only a miserable existence. Many physicists of to-day do not believe any longer in their existence, but they tolerate them because they aid greatly in describing phenomena and because they cannot yet be replaced by anything better. However, a remarkable experiment has already been made by Clerk Maxwell in connection with Faraday's speculations to trace electrical phenomena back to conditions and motions of light, just as, conversely, the vibrations of light can be considered as being small electrical currents. The time is not very far distant when the number of imponderables will, with full certainty, be reduced to one, *i. e.*, the ether of light.

If the corrections of Maxwell's or somebody else's view could be fully established the inductions (properly called in German *Fernwirkung*) of electrical forces would appear in quite a new light. The absolute inconceivableness of any immediate effect produced at the distance has been already most earnestly dis-

cussed by Newton in a letter to Bentley, writing with regard to the effect of gravitation at a distance about as follows: "The supposition that gravity is essential to matter so that a body could affect another distant one, even through a vacuum and without the mediation of anything else, through and by which its effect and force is transferred, appears to me so great an absurdity that I do not believe that anybody who possesses the power of discerning natural processes could ever think of it. Gravitation must be produced by an agent which works constantly according to definite laws; but whether this agent is material or immaterial I leave to the consideration of my readers."

According to Maxwell's theory the luminiferous ether would be at least, for electrical forces, that requisite transforming medium.

The results of later investigations into fluid motions reveal to us quite unexpectedly the secret of accomplishing such a transformation. Among the different pertinent phenomena of hydro-dynamics we may mention here the following, which was first theoretically established by Bjerknes in Christiania, and then afterwards confirmed by experiment. Two balls being at a moderate distance from each other under water show at first no remarkable phenomenon. But as soon as by proper arrangement both are brought into exactly corresponding rotations they exert an influence upon each other, very similar to that of two magnetic needles. This reciprocal influence is brought about by the particles of the fluid which are likewise set rotating—a phenomenon that can be made visible. If a single rotating ball under water is brought near a small body swimming under water, the latter will be either *attracted* or *repelled* according to its being heavier or lighter than water. The well-known so-called acoustic attraction, caused by the effect of a tuning fork upon light bodies near by, is most intimately related to this phenomenon. These facts are therefore so very important because they present the possibility of producing apparent inductions of transference through an easily

movable medium. Whether now the electrical inductions are really based on a transferring medium, *e. g.*, the ether of light, the future will reveal. But whatever the result may be to obtain a deeper insight into the true process of electrical phenomena is one of the chief aims of the present time.

This abstract scientific object receives at the same time a mighty impulse through the splendid achievements which the technics of electric illumination, transmutation of force, accumulation of force, telephony, etc., have almost daily to record. These circumstances work together to bring again the study of electricity, especially in our days, into the foreground, as it has been the case quite often in former times; so first, at the time of Franklin, when the electric nature of thunderstorms was recognized, then at the beginning of our century after the discovery of galvanism and the pile of Volta, and at last during the third decade, when Faraday's unexcelled activity in the sphere of discoveries, especially in electricity and magnetism, celebrated its most brilliant triumphs—on all sides the attempts were made to remove the veil from the mysterious character of electricity. Here busy minds were at work studying the splendid phenomena of the discharge of electricity through the highly rarefied vapors of Geissler's tubes, there studying the processes going forward when the current of electricity passes through liquid chemical compounds; others examine the influence of electric forces upon the change of volume and the double computation of insulators, or the origin of electric polarity of hemimorphic crystals by pressure; still others subject the electric phenomena to a purely mathematical examination—in short, the age of electricity has arrived, the age of steam is passing away.

Our arguments show that the hypotheses referring the origin of all natural phenomena to the interaction of two distinct substances—ponderable mass and ether—have not yet been fully established. Nevertheless, Sir William Thomson has already proceeded to reduce these two fundamental substances to a single one—the ether. He considers the atoms of bodies to be

rings formed of ether, resembling in their form the rings which an expert tobacco-smoker is able to produce. For such formations, originated within a frictionless medium, have, indeed, according to v. Helmholtz's calculations, the property of indestructibility, in spite of the most various changes of form. They also must, as we learn from hydro-dynamics, on account of being in a disturbed medium, exert apparent inductions upon one another, which would somewhat explain molecular forces. But a more thorough treatment of this hypothesis is not yet called for.

This short survey of the present results and aims of natural philosophy, compared with its status at the beginning of our century, shows at least that marvellous progress has been made in understanding nature. But we have, therefore, no reason to be especially boastful, for the amount of ignorance in this direction is yet gigantic. Numberless problems still remain to be solved. And on account of the great variety of methods which must be employed in the different spheres of physics, it is hardly possible for any single searcher after truth to be active as an original investigator in many of these spheres. Limitation is necessary, if any successful result shall be reached. Of course, such a limitation would lead to narrowness, if the connection of these special problems with the great aims of science should be lost sight of. Only as long as the specialist keeps abreast with the great achievements in all the departments of natural science, can he be expected to treat physical science in that sense in which it should be treated—namely, as exact natural philosophy.

In conclusion, it may be allowable to state that these arguments have not been presented to draw metaphysical conclusions from them. We are well aware that the atomic theory does not aid in the least to explain ultimately the world and its contents. It simply reduces the sensible appearance of things to the elements of this appearance, just as little is claimed for the hypothesis of the conservation of energy in its relation to the origin of life. We may be permitted to treat the meta-

physical side of these problems in later articles. It is, however, most necessary to study the so-called mechanical view of the world in all its details, and it is the duty of the Church to offer her sons ample opportunity to pursue such studies and to equip her institutions as fully as the times require it.

*Lancaster, Pa.*

## VI. GOETHE.\*

BY REV. JOHN M. TITZEL, D.D.

IN December, 1821, Byron published the tragedy of *Sardanapalus* which he dedicated to Goethe then still living. In the dedication he calls the latter poet "the illustrious Goethe who has created the literature of his own country, and illustrated that of Europe." In 1832, soon after the death of Goethe, Carlyle, in an article contributed to the "Foreign Quarterly Review," said: "Of great men, among so many millions of noted men, it is computed that in our time there have been two; one in the practical, another in the speculative province: Napoleon Bonaparte and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe." Of the two, moreover, in his opinion, the latter was "intrinsically of much more unquestionable greatness and even importance," and failed to be noted by the world as such, only because "the explosion of powder mines and artillery parks naturally attracts every eye and ear," while "the approach of a new-created star (dawning on us, in new-created radiance, from the eternal deeps!) though *this*, and not the artillery parks, is to shape our destiny and *rule* the lower earth, is notable at first only to certain star-gazers and weather-prophets." This high estimate of Goethe when first given to the world, was by many considered to be like the eulogies of the ordinary funeral oration, somewhat of an exaggeration. But after more than fifty years have passed away, giving ample time for careful study of the man and his works, it is now generally conceded to be correct. In the "Contemporary Review" for 1884, the brilliant author of "*Ecce Homo*" writes as follows: "Goethe seems

\* An essay read before the Cllosophic Society, Lancaster, Pa.



to be rising once more above the horizon. He is the youngest of the world's great authors; the latest who has laid a claim, that seems in a fair way of being allowed, to a place above the rank of merely national authors. The books that belong to the whole world alike, are few, and even of these some have owed their universal acceptance to an accident. Fewer still are the authors who have so written that their personal character, their way of thinking and feeling, becomes a matter of perpetual interest, not only in their own country and age, but in every country where men study and in every age. Goethe appears to belong to this very small group. If he is not yet formally canonized, he has long been a *Bienheureux*. If little more than half a century has passed since his death, the first part of 'Faust' has been before the world three-quarters of a century; and of his first brilliant appearance in authorship the century is several years behind us. When we consider not only the period through which his fascination has lasted, but also the reaction it has surmounted and the vitality it exhibits, we may see our way to conclude that his fame is now as secure as any literary fame can be, and that it will only yield to some deep-working revolution of thought—which, perhaps, it would be rash to pronounce impossible—some twilight of the gods, in which not only Goethe but also Shakespeare and Dante should fall from heaven."

We may look upon Goethe therefore not only as one of the chief representatives of the spirit of modern Germany, but, at the same time, also, as one of the chief interpreters and fashioners of the spirit of the nineteenth century. As such he may well claim our careful study. For Carlyle truly says: "The Great man of an age is, beyond comparison, the most important phenomenon therein; all other phenomena were they Waterloo victories, constitutions of the year one, glorious revolutions, new births of the golden age in what sort you will, are small and trivial. Alas, all these pass away, and are left extinct behind like the tar-barrels they were celebrated with; and the new-born golden age proves always to be still-born: neither

is there, was there or will there be any other golden age possible, save only in this, in new increase of worth and wisdom; that is to say, therefore, in the new arrival among us of wise and worthy men. Such arrivals are the great occurrences, though unnoticed ones; all else that can occur, in what kind soever, is but the *road*, up-hill or down hill, rougher or smoother, nowise the power that will nerve us for travelling forward thereon. So little comparatively can forethought or the cunningest mechanical precontrivance do for a nation, for a world! Ever must we wait on the bounty of Time, and see what leader shall be born for us and whither he will lead." These leaders therefore above all other things demand our attention if we would understand the onward movements of the world's history.

In the study of men, be they great or small, three distinct elements require always to be considered by us if we would rightly interpret them. These elements are heredity, environment and the individual will power. The life of every person is conditioned to some extent by the lives of those who have preceded him and whose blood flows in his veins. Our ancestors live in us all, and from them we have inherited not only the basis of our physical powers, but the basis of our intellectual and spiritual qualities as well. So also is the life of every person conditioned by his environment. What we are in a measure, at least, is always due to what those around us are. The civilized infant reared by savages becomes a savage, and the savage infant reared by civilized persons becomes civilized. Great men never appear singly. The environment of a man ever becomes a part of him in some form or other. But no person is ever the mere creature of heredity or of circumstances. Every man is possessed of an individual will-power which is potent within certain limitations, and the self-determinations of which always enter as a very important factor into the making of his life and character. The ancients were right in holding the maxim, *Quisquis suae fortunae faber*. Heredity and environment furnish the substance out of which the individual life must

be built, but the building itself, be it a temple of the living God or a Joss-house, "a thing of beauty and a joy forever," or a hideous ruin full of dead men's bones, is the work of the individual self. We are indeed all of us the architects of our own lives and fortunes, though limited somewhat as to results by the nature of the material out of which we must construct them.

The more immediate ancestors of Goethe, though not specially distinguished, were nevertheless persons of more than ordinary force of character. His paternal grandfather was a journeyman tailor of Artern, who, after considerable wandering about, finally settled in Frankfort-on-the-Main. One who is said to have known him, describes him as "courteous, of thorough musical attainment, but off his head with pride." He was twice married, the latter time in his forty-eighth year to a comely widow of thirty-seven years of age, Cornelia Schelhorn, the owner of an inn, and perhaps, of some other property. The third and last child of this second union was Johann Kasper Goethe, the father of the poet. He was educated in letters in the Pädagogium of Coburg, and later studied law at Leipzig and Giessen, winning at the latter place his Doctor of Laws, with a masterly dissertation. He then traveled considerably in his own country and through Italy, and finally settled down as an imperial councillor in his native city. He is represented by the biographers of our poet as a formal, stern, upright man, possessed of solid learning, sober judgment, determined will, artistic and literary tastes, and passionate in outbreak of wrath when he considered himself wronged, but, nevertheless, of a tender, simple, pure heart. In his thirty-ninth year he was married to Katharina Elizabeth Textor, a genial, noble-hearted, vivacious and affectionate girl of seventeen summers, gifted with a vivid imagination and healthy naturalness of feeling, and fond of poetry and the romantic lore of the nursery, though of limited education excepting in music and singing, in which she had acquired some proficiency. She was the daughter of Johann Wolfgang Textor, the chief magis-

trate of the city, who himself was the grandson of the famous jurist of the same name and the son of an advocate and councillor to the elector Palatine. Of herself in after years she said: "Order and quiet are my characteristics. I despatch at once what I have to do, the most disagreeable always first, and I gulp down the devil without looking at him. When all has returned to the proper state, then I defy any one to surpass me in good humor." She also says: "I never bemoralize any one—always seek out the good that is in them and leave what is bad to Him who made mankind and knows how to round off the angles." The poet was the first-born child of his parents. In one of his poems he says: "From my father I derive my frame and the steady guidance of my life, and from my dear, little mother my happy disposition and my love of story telling."

Goethe first saw the light of day in the old "free elective and commercial City of the Empire," Frankfort-on-the-Main, between the hour of noon and one o'clock, on the 28th of August, 1749. "It was," says Professor Heinrich Düntzer, in his interesting life of the great German poet, "a good time and place to be born. Just before the end of the first half of the century of the Illumination (*Aufklärung*); in the morning dawn of German poetry—for in 1749 the first five Cantos of the *Messias* came out, and Lessing and Wieland, who, at the same time as Klopstock, and with like strivings, were the beginners of a new time in the literature of our Fatherland, were then in the first stage of their development. And what German city offered a more rich and varied life, more freedom for growth, a more agitated intellectual air, a more lively concourse of distinguished strangers than this imperial city, lying so close to the noblest German river on its tributary Main?" In this city the poet passed the earlier years of his earthly existence. His position as one who moves in middle life brought him into contact with the more cultivated, and sometimes, also, with the ruder elements of human society. The instruction which he received during this period was thorough, but mostly private. Only for

a brief time did he attend a public school. Among the things which especially influenced him were, first the puppet-shows given for his and his sister's entertainment and the stories told by his mother, and later, the poetry of Klopstock, the great earthquake at Lisbon, the seven years' war and the occupation of his native city by French troops, and the imperial coronation which took place in it. At the age of sixteen he was matriculated as a student in the University at Leipzig, where he pursued his studies with more or less success for three years. He then returned home, suffering from lung trouble brought on by his imprudence, and spent eighteen months in Frankfort; after which he entered the University of Strassburg from which he obtained the degree of licentiate of law, August 6, 1771. The four years immediately following, he passed principally in Frankfort, practicing law and writing poetry, the latter, however, engaging most of his attention. During this period he spent a summer at Wetzlar, at the urgent request of his father, to gain more exact knowledge of law procedure, and also traveled through the Rhine country and through Switzerland. In 1775 Charles Augustus, the good Duke of Saxe Weimar, invited him to spend a few weeks at his court. He accepted the invitation, and the result was that the Grand Duke and the poet became very warm and devoted friends of one another. This led to Goethe's being appointed an officer of the court of Weimar, and to his making Weimar his permanent home during the remainder of his life. Here he lived, engaged in discharging his official duties, and in scientific and literary work, until full of years and full of honors he gently fell asleep in death on the 22nd of March, 1832; and here, in the Fürstengruft, his dust reposes, as he desired, by that of his friend and fellow-poet, Schiller, in an oaken shrine in front of the bronze coffins of the Grand Duke Charles Augustus and the Duchess Louise.

During the time he was connected with the Court of Weimar, Goethe revisited Switzerland, spent two years in Italy and visited various parts of the German Fatherland, so that he came in direct contact with nature and art in their sublimer and

more beautiful, as well as in their more ordinary forms. He was also intimately associated with many of the most brilliant men and women of his time. Stilling, Lavater, Herder, Wieland, Jacobi and Schiller were among his intimate friends. He also had personal interviews with the great Napoleon and the famous Madame de Staël. Through his knowledge of the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, French and English languages, as well as of his mother tongue, he was enabled, moreover, to hold communion through their works with the greatest thinkers of all ages.

His relations with the gentler sex were also such as could not fail to give breadth and depth to his experience. At the early age of fourteen years he was deeply enamored of a young girl in the humblest ranks of society, named Grechèn, whose memory long haunted him. While a student at Leipzig, Anna Katharina Schökopf made a marked impression on his heart and caused him many anxious thoughts; and during his stay at Strassburg he was so captivated by Freiderike Elisabetha Brion, the third daughter of a Lutheran Evangelical pastor at Sessenheim, that he made a declaration of love to her, which she reciprocated, though he finally left her without proposing marriage. The summer he spent at Wetzlar, he fell in love with Charlotte Buff, who was betrothed to his friend Kestner. His experience in this case had something to do with the production of his novel, "The Sufferings of Young Werther." After this, and not long before his removal to Weimar, he was greatly charmed by Anna Elizabeth Shöneman, a beautiful and captivating young lady of good family, whom he has immortalized in his works under the name of *Lili*. After an assiduous courtship of several months, through the well-meant intervention of a "merchant spinster" of Heidelberg, who is represented to have been "a sworn foe to all 'Langen und Bangen,'" Goethe and Lili were engaged to be married.

But it was not long until the flame of love in the poet's heart began to flicker, and the engagement was broken off, though not without pain to both parties. At Weimar, Goethe was very



much interested in the wife of Baron von Stein, Charlotte Albertine Ernestine von Stein, whose silhouette was shown to him the summer before his removal to Weimar, and whose face then robbed him of three nights' sleep. The first ten years of his residence in Weimar he was most devoted to her, though she was seven years older than he, and the mother of seven children. Of their relation to one another Professor Boyesen says :

"Of course Goethe loved Frau von Stein with something more than a brotherly affection, although he frequently, in his letters, addressed her as his sister; but he was well aware of the hopelessness of his love. To be sure, she reciprocated his feelings; her own wedded life had failed to satisfy the deeper needs of her nature, and the pure homage and devotion of a man like Goethe must have been ineffably sweet to her. She, therefore, without compromising her dignity, exerted herself to keep him close to her as her trusted friend and admirer. The intellectual resources of her mind were great, and her power of sympathy was still greater; what wonder, then, that Goethe, with his wealth of unformed and half-formed ideas, which were ever struggling for utterance, should have felt irresistibly drawn toward her, if for no other reason, only to relieve himself of the burden of unuttered thought, which must at times have weighed so heavily on him?"

On the poet's return from Italy, Frau von Stein manifested some coldness towards him, which finally led to his transferring his affections to Christiane Sophie Vulpius, a maiden of humble rank, who had just passed her twenty-second summer, and with whom he accidentally became acquainted. Professor Düntzer, in his "Life of Goethe," describes her as being, at the time the poet met her, "a winsome little blonde, with beautiful blue eyes, a pretty nose, pouting lips, a round full face, and long fair hair." He also states that "Goethe was completely captivated by her personal charms, her amiability, her Thuringian *naïveté*, and by her evident happiness in having won the love of the great man whom she had looked on as so far above her." This



young woman Goethe took to himself as his wife, July 13, 1788, but he was not regularly married to her before October 19, 1806, when his son Augustus, the only one of his children who lived to grow up, was fifteen years of age. The marriage of the poet, in view of all the circumstances, it is scarcely necessary to say, was a mortification to his friends and has been ever since more or less of a cross to his admirers. Of its irregularity no right-minded person can approve. Whether, however, he acted foolishly in taking such a wife to himself is an open question. Mr. Hamerton, in his book on "*The Intellectual Life*," gives it as the opinion of a distinguished artist, whose experience qualified him to speak, that "a man devoted to art might marry either a plain-minded woman, who would occupy herself exclusively with household matters and shield his peace by taking these cares upon herself, or else a woman quite capable of entering into his artistic life; but he was convinced that a marriage which exposed him to unintelligent criticism and interference would be dangerous in the highest degree. And of the two kinds of marriage which he considered possible he preferred the former, that with the entirely ignorant and simple person from whom no interference was to be apprehended." Goethe may have looked at the matter in the same light.

Personally Goethe was magnificently endowed. He was a man of splendid physique and of towering genius. His intellect was keen and penetrating, his imagination vivid and active, his judgment clear and sound, his memory prompt and retentive, and his will firm and persistent. He was, moreover, a man of large heart, of broad human sympathies, of cheerful and buoyant disposition, and of great independence of spirit. It was his invariable custom to do his own thinking, and he always spoke or wrote from the depths of his own convictions. All the powers which he possessed he sought most carefully to cultivate and perfect. The great object of his life was to develop all that was in him and to make his own existence harmonious.

The greatness of his powers early manifested itself. In childhood already he was remarkable on account of his rapid

acquisition of knowledge and mental grasp. Before he was ten years of age he wrote several languages with correctness, invented stories and meditated poems. One of the stories of these early days, entitled "The New Paris," the poet has preserved in his Autobiography, and no one who reads it can fail, I think, to wonder that a boy so young could compose so marvellous a tale.

"Götz von Berlichingen" and "The Sufferings of Young Werther," by the publication of which Goethe, as a star of the first magnitude, suddenly arose above the horizon in the literary heavens, were also written while he was yet a comparatively young man. Nor was this early development followed, as is so often the case, by early decay. On the contrary, Goethe did not reach the zenith of his literary fame until, in his fifty-seventh year, the first part of "Faust" was published; and during the twenty-six years that followed he wonderfully maintained his intellectual vigor, and continued to produce and give to the world such works as only he could compose.

But Goethe was not only a man of brilliant genius, but also of broad and thorough culture. Nothing pertaining to nature or to humanity was foreign to him. He was not merely well versed in literature and history, but also in science and art. He was no mean painter, and at one time was in doubt as to whether painting or poetry was his true vocation. He was also deeply interested in the study of Architecture and wrote on the subject. In science he may be ranked as a master. Of Anatomy, Botany, Chemistry, Geology and Physics he had an extensive knowledge. He wrote on Optics, on the Metamorphosis of Plants, and on Comparative Anatomy; and in his views on all these subjects he displayed unusual penetration and sagacity. He suggested the leading idea of modern botany, made important discoveries in anatomy, and helped forward a true knowledge of color. In his broad generalizations he was to some extent a precursor of Darwin and Herbert Spencer.

In the discharge of his duties as a public officer of the Court of Saxe-Weimar, Goethe, moreover, proved himself to be a

person of superior practical wisdom. Usually it is supposed that men of genius are little better than dunces as regards the conducting of the affairs of State or of every-day life. But that this is not necessarily the case Goethe abundantly demonstrated by the course which he pursued. No affairs could have possibly been better administered than were those intrusted to him. In every department to which he was assigned he brought order out of confusion; and through his influence and direction the little city of Weimar became one of the most noted places in all Europe.

It was, however, in the province of literature that Goethe achieved his grandest triumphs. As a poet and a writer he is one of the great intellectual kings of the earth, and his name "one of the few, the immortal names that were not born to die." As such he is without a superior—yea, indeed, without an equal in modern times; for he is unquestionably the greatest poet that has arisen since Shakspeare was called away from earth. "His lyrics are among the freshest and truest that have ever been written, his dramas among the grandest and profoundest, and his prose works among the richest in observation, in critical acumen, in simple beauty and in practical wisdom. In reading him, one seems to catch the echo of the music of the spheres.

"The sovereign poet," says a brilliant author of our times, "must be not merely a singer, but also a sage; to passion and music he must add large ideas; he must extend in width as well as in height; but, besides this, he must be no dreamer or fanatic, and must be rooted as firmly in the hard earth as he spreads widely and mounts freely towards the sky." In Goethe all these conditions are satisfied. He is not only a sweet singer, but one of the broadest and profoundest thinkers of all ages. Emerson says of him: "There is no trace of provincial limitation in his muse. He is not a debtor to his position, but was born with a free and controlling genius." His universality is attested by the fact that various parties have claimed him as their own. He says of himself, in a letter to his friend Jacobi: "For my part, with the manifold directions in which my nature

moves, I cannot be satisfied with a single mode of thought. As a poet and artist, I am a polytheist; on the other hand, as a student of nature, I am a pantheist,—and both with equal positiveness. When I need a God for my personal nature, as a moral and spiritual man, He also exists for me. The heavenly and the earthly things are such an immense realm that it can only be grasped by the collective intelligence of all beings." Goethe is also one of the most serious and truthful of writers. His works are the product of his own convictions and experiences. "He is absolutely bent," says Professor Seeley, "upon grasping and expressing the truth; he has no pleasure in any imaginations, however splendid or impressive, which he cannot feel to be true; on the other hand, when he feels that he is dealing with truth he seems to care little, and sometimes to forget altogether, that it is not interesting." It was his broad, truth-loving mind and heart that made Goethe great; and these alone can make any man truly great. Strong partizans are always of necessity contracted men. Men of force they may be, but never men of real greatness.

Of the works of Goethe the two greatest, it is generally conceded, are "*Faust*" and "*Wilhelm Meister*." Of the first-named of these works a competent critic well says: "It appeals to all minds with the irresistible fascination of an eternal problem, and with the charm of endless variety. It has every element—wit, pathos, wisdom, buffoonery, mystery, melody, reverence, doubt, magic and irony; not a chord of the lyre is unstrung, not a fibre of the heart untouched. . . . It is at once a problem and a picture; the problem embraces all questions of vital importance; the picture represents all opinions, all sentiments, all classes moving on the stage of life." Of "*Wilhelm Meister*" Emerson, in his masterly way, writes: "'*Wilhelm Meister*' is a novel in every sense, the first of its kind, called by its admirers the only delineation of modern society—as if other novels, those of Scott, for example, dealt with costume and condition, this with the spirit of life. It is a book over which some veil is still drawn. It is read by very

intelligent persons with wonder and delight. It is preferred by some such to Hamlet as a work of genius. I suppose no book of this century can compare with it in its delicious sweetness, so new, so provoking to the mind, gratifying it with so many and so solid thoughts, just insights into life and manners and character; so many good hints for the conduct of life, so many unexpected glimpses into a higher sphere, and never a trace of rhetoric or dullness. A very provoking book to the curiosity of young men of genius, but a very unsatisfying one. Lovers of light-reading, those who look in it for the entertainment they find in romance are disappointed. On the other hand, those who begin it for the higher hope to read in it a worthy history of genius and the just reward of the laurel to its toils and denials, have also reason to complain. . . . Goethe's hero has so many weaknesses and impurities and keeps such had company, that the sober English public, when the book was translated, were disgusted. And yet it is so crammed with wisdom, with knowledge of the world and with knowledge of laws; the persons so truly and subtly drawn, and with such few strokes, and not a word too much—the book remains ever so new and unexhausted that we must even let it go its own way and be willing to get what good from it we can, assured that it has only begun its office and has millions of readers yet to serve."

It might be instructive to give some account of other works of Goethe which are not so generally known, but to do so properly would in itself require a long essay. I shall make no attempt, therefore, in this direction, but leave those who are interested in our poet to study his works for themselves, assuring them they will find none of them without interest and value.

That there may be no misapprehension as regards the character of Goethe and his writings, it seems, however, necessary yet to say, that he is not without his serious faults, although Carlyle rather sarcastically remarks that "he believes it was ascertained long ago that there is no one free from them." Of

Goethe Emerson very correctly says: "He has not worshipped the highest Unity; he is incapable of a self-surrender to the moral sentiment. There are nobler strains in poetry than any he has sounded. There are writers poorer in talent, whose tone is purer and more touches the heart." As regards the defects of Goethe it seems to me they are in a great measure to be traced to the fact that he failed to realize that man is by nature a fallen being. He hated the doctrine of man's depravity as dishonoring to man, and, consequently, did not believe that there is any need for a Divine Redeemer. He held that man was naturally good, and that all that was necessary to his perfection was self-culture, and that this required that his natural instincts should be gratified. This, I think accounts for the prominence given to art and to the things of the present life in "*Wilhelm Meister*," and for the extraordinary levity with which in it the relations of men and women are treated, as also for the defects in his other works and in his own life. He seems to have been in reality more a worshipper of the God of Naturalism than the God of Christianity. This may have been due, as some claim, to the pietistic form of Christianity which prevailed in Germany in his day, whose dualistic conception of the universe he could not accept and so become skeptical. With the form of religion named, and with a corrupt Catholicism, he unquestionably came most in contact, and his writings, there can be no doubt, have done good work in the way of correcting their errors, but this does not justify his own position. Carlyle maintained that in later life, he surmounted his skepticism and became really a light in religion as well as in philosophy. But there is no good reason for believing that he ever changed his views as regards the point I have indicated. In his old age the Countess Auguste von Bernstoff (née Stolberg) wrote to him, exhorting him to turn his gaze and his heart to eternal things. In his reply to her he wrote: "To live long is to outlive much; beloved, hated, indifferent men; kingdoms, capitals, cities, nay, forests and trees, that when young we sowed and planted. . . .



intelligent persons with wonder and delight. It is preferred by some such to Hamlet as a work of genius. I suppose no book of this century can compare with it in its delicious sweetness, so new, so provoking to the mind, gratifying it with so many and so solid thoughts, just insights into life and manners and character ; so many good hints for the conduct of life, so many unexpected glimpses into a higher sphere, and never a trace of rhetoric or dullness. A very provoking book to the curiosity of young men of genius, but a very unsatisfying one. Lovers of light-reading, those who look in it for the entertainment they find in romance are disappointed. On the other hand, those who begin it for the higher hope to read in it a worthy history of genius and the just reward of the laurel to its toils and denials, have also reason to complain. . . . Goethe's hero has so many weaknesses and impurities and keeps such had company, that the sober English public, when the book was translated, were disgusted. And yet it is so crammed with wisdom, with knowledge of the world and with knowledge of laws ; the persons so truly and subtly drawn, and with such few strokes, and not a word too much—the book remains ever so new and unexhausted that we must even let it go its own way and be willing to get what good from it we can, assured that it has only begun its office and has millions of readers yet to serve."

It might be instructive to give some account of other works of Goethe which are not so generally known, but to do so properly would in itself require a long essay. I shall make no attempt, therefore, in this direction, but leave those who are interested in our poet to study his works for themselves, assuring them they will find none of them without interest and value.

That there may be no misapprehension as regards the character of Goethe and his writings, it seems, however, necessary yet to say, that he is not without his serious faults, although Carlyle rather sarcastically remarks that "he believes it was ascertained long ago that there is no one free from them." Of



Goethe Emerson very correctly says: "He has not worshipped the highest Unity; he is incapable of a self-surrender to the moral sentiment. There are nobler strains in poetry than any he has sounded. There are writers poorer in talent, whose tone is purer and more touches the heart." As regards the defects of Goethe it seems to me they are in a great measure to be traced to the fact that he failed to realize that man is by nature a fallen being. He hated the doctrine of man's depravity as dishonoring to man, and, consequently, did not believe that there is any need for a Divine Redeemer. He held that man was naturally good, and that all that was necessary to his perfection was self-culture, and that this required that his natural instincts should be gratified. This, I think accounts for the prominence given to art and to the things of the present life in "*Wilhelm Meister*," and for the extraordinary levity with which in it the relations of men and women are treated, as also for the defects in his other works and in his own life. He seems to have been in reality more a worshipper of the God of Naturalism than the God of Christianity. This may have been due, as some claim, to the pietistic form of Christianity which prevailed in Germany in his day, whose dualistic conception of the universe he could not accept and so become skeptical. With the form of religion named, and with a corrupt Catholicism, he unquestionably came most in contact, and his writings, there can be no doubt, have done good work in the way of correcting their errors, but this does not justify his own position. Carlyle maintained that in later life, he surmounted his skepticism and became really a light in religion as well as in philosophy. But there is no good reason for believing that he ever changed his views as regards the point I have indicated. In his old age the Countess Auguste von Bernstoff (née Stolberg) wrote to him, exhorting him to turn his gaze and his heart to eternal things. In his reply to her he wrote: "To live long is to outlive much; beloved, hated, indifferent men; kingdoms, capitals, cities, nay, forests and trees, that when young we sowed and planted. . . .

All this fleeting show we accept unconcerned ; we are not troubled by the evanescence of Time if the eternal is every moment present. All my life I have meant honestly towards myself and others, and in all my earthly action have looked to the highest. You and yours have done the same. We will then continue to labor while it is day ; a sun will shine for others also ; they will play their part, and meanwhile for us there will be a clearer light." Beautiful as these words are they give us no indication of that poverty of spirit which is the first beatitude. Let us trust, however, that his hope in some way has been realized and that what, dying, he last asked for may have been granted him, "Light, more light."

But taking him just as he was, with all his faults, Goethe is, nevertheless, a grand and imposing character in the literature of the world, and not without reason did the great Napoleon say with reference to him, "*Voilà un homme*," and Carlyle close his essay on his works with the words, "*Vixit, vivit*."

## VII.

### NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

**THE PSYCHIC LIFE OF MICRO-ORGANISMS.** A study in experimental psychology by Alfred Binet. Translated from the French by Thomas McCormick. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1889. Price, 75 cents in cloth, 50 cents in paper.

The author of this little book endeavors to show "that psychological phenomena begin among the very lowest classes of beings; that they are met with in every form of life from the simplest cellule to the most complicated organism. It is they that are the essential phenomena of life inherent in all protoplasm." As a representative of the theory of vitalism he opposes the theory of mechanism "which attempts to explain all phenomena of life from physico-chemical forces." He also confutes the theory of Romanes, who denies the existence of psychological phenomena in lower organisms, to which he assigns only "protoplasmic movements and the property of excitability." Mr. Binet maintains that such a view would "assume that psychological phenomena could be superadded in the course of evolution, in proportion as an organism grows more perfect and complete. Nothing could be more inconsistent with the teachings of general physiology, which shows us that all vital phenomena are previously present in non-differentiated cells."

Dr. Alfred Binet, who is a physician in Paris, is thoroughly conversant with the latest results of biological research. He presents the wonders of the microscopic world in a masterly way; every page of the book deserves the highest consideration from all scientific thinkers. The reader will, however, be disappointed, if he expects to find anything like a solution of the question, so much agitated by modern psychologists and physiologists, as to whether self-consciousness and free self-determination are the result of the development of the psychic life present in the lowest organisms, Dr. Binet says: "The apparent result of our investigations is that the greater number of movements and actions observed in micro-organisms are direct responses to excitations emanating from the medium in which they live. It is the condition of the medium that, to all appearance, rigidly determines the character and manner of their activity (from the sensory to the motory phase); in a word they exhibit no marks of pre-adaptation." And further: "We are not in a position to determine whether these various acts are accompanied by conscious-

ness or whether they follow as simple physiological processes. This question we are obliged to forego." Dr. Binet accordingly is an evolutionist after the order of Emil DuBois-Reymond, who asserts so energetically that the origin of sensation and consciousness is inexplicable and seems to take the origin of self-consciousness for granted, and as needing no further explanation, if only consciousness is once present. We have reached the conclusion that Dr. Binet's propositions do not lead us to any higher conception of the psychic life of micro-organisms than the purely materialistic view has established, namely, that the reaction of sentient subject against its external incitements is simply the purely mechanical and physical action and reaction of pure matter—that means, the idea of design in nature is denied. We recommend the book to all earnest students of the great problems of evolution, as being unexcelled in the representation of modern biological investigations.

THREE INTRODUCTORY LECTURES ON THE SCIENCE OF THOUGHT, delivered at the Royal Institution, London, during the month of March, 1887. First published in the Open Court of June, July and August, 1887. By F. Max Müller. With an appendix which contains a correspondence on "Thoughts Without Words," between F. Max Müller and Francis Dalton, the Duke of Argyll, George J. Romanes and others. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 169-175 LaSalle Street. 1888. Price, 75 cents.

The contents of this little volume of 125 pages are essentially a repetition of the preface of Max Müller's larger work "The Science of Thought." There are, however, a few valuable additions, which alone merit the purchase of the book even by those who possess the larger work. Max Müller was one of the first who had the courage to discard the all-ruling principle of Hegel's philosophy and to maintain that it is not sufficient to follow the *a priori* method of philosophical study unless the *a posteriori* method is made its basis. We all know the revolution which has since been wrought in all the departments of philosophical study. The author of the book on "The Science of Thought" says: "My book is the natural outcome of that philosophical and historical study of language which began with Leibnitz, and which during our century has so widely spread and ramified as to overshadow nearly all sciences, not excepting what I call the Science of Thought. I hold that a full appreciation of the true nature of language and a recognition of its inseparableness from thought will prove the best means of recovering that unbroken thread which binds our modern schools of thought most closely together with those of the Middle Ages and of ancient Greece. It alone helps us to reconcile systems of philosophy hitherto supposed to be entirely antagonistic. If I am right, then what we call the history of philosophy will assume a totally new aspect. It will reveal itself before our eyes as the natural growth of language, though at the same time as a constant struggle of old against new language; in fact, as a dialectic process, in the true sense of the word." He

identifies reason with language and says that it is the growth of centuries and the work of man originally derived from 800 roots, which can be reduced to about 120 concepts, the latter having been brought to higher and higher perfection by the leading thinkers and speakers of the world.

All scientists trace all the languages back to certain roots which are more or less common to the different groups of languages. To the question, that now arises—How did these roots originate?—the linguists give us three different answers. The onomatopoeic theory traces them to imitations of the sound; the interjectional theory to expression of the feelings, and a third theory, that of Max Müller, declares the roots to be phonetic types. The reasons which the latter gives for his theory are quite convincing. Even if in a purely hypothetical way a language could be thought of *in abstracto*, the roots of which only consist in imitations of sounds or interjections, still in the really existing languages, so far as we can trace back and uncover these roots, the roots imitating sounds and the interjectional roots form only a small and entirely isolated minority, which neither shares in nor is capable of development. By far the greater number of roots and all which are capable of development express abstractions from visible objects, conditions and activities, and therefore presume a human intelligence, reflecting with self-consciousness, which formed and used the roots. Max Müller looks back of this period, still open to science, in which the root-elements of the human languages were fixed, a long period of growth of the elements of language, in which the roots were separated from the multitude of nascent tones by elimination or natural selection in the struggle for existence. In this realm the naturalistic evolutionists are now in entire accord. But philology commits itself here to speculation and abandons the *a posteriori* method of investigation; it becomes, therefore, more or less hypothetical. We are, however, inclined to think that Max Müller is not an evolutionist in the sense of Darwin, but that he acknowledges self-consciousness as the basis of reason and language and as such given by God to man only.

THE IDEA OF GOD. By Paul CARRS, Ph.D. A paper read before the Society for Ethical Culture, at Chicago, 1888. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 169-175 La Salle Street, P. O. Drawer F. 1888.

The author of this pamphlet containing 26 pages is a thorough-going Darwinist. He holds the onomatopoeic theory of language and bases upon that theory a new idea of God. After having presented the current ideas of a deity he gives a definition of his own and says "God is the Ethical Life of Nature; this definition seems to me to contain all that is true in the definitions of kindred conceptions, but is at the same time free from any supernaturalism and anthropomorphism. God, in this sense, is life in its growth and

humanity in its progress." And further: "Our view of God is not theism, not pantheism and not atheism. It does not teach that God is a person above the world, nor does it identify God with nature, nor does it deny God's existence altogether. If our view must be labeled and registered among the different 'isms,' I must form a new word and call it 'Entheism,' which clearly denotes the conception of a monistic God who is immanent, not transcendent, who is in many respects different from nature and yet pervades all nature." We refrain from any comment on this latest nonsense produced by a member of the Society for Ethical Culture. Any one who wants to be amused will find ample opportunity in reading this pamphlet.

ELEMENTS OF HEBREW SYNTAX. By William R. Harper, Professor of Semitic Languages, Yale University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1888.

This book meets a need long felt by Hebrew teachers. The importance of a full knowledge of the syntactical principles of a language cannot well be over-estimated, especially in the case of a Semitic language, in which the exact determination of the sense is, to a great extent, dependent on the context. Hebrew has been studied for ages, and yet not until recent times has its syntax become an object of truly philosophical investigation. Here, as elsewhere, Ewald broke a new path which has since been successfully followed by others. To gather up the latest and best results and present them in a form intelligible to beginners is a *desideratum*. There has been, in fact, no book covering the entire field of Hebrew syntax suitable to place in the hands of young students. Dr. Harper has now furnished what is required. He is peculiarly qualified for the task, not only by his enthusiasm for Semitic studies, but especially by his extensive and accurate knowledge of the Hebrew, his broad experience as a teacher and his marvellous skill in making things plain. All the excellences which characterize his other text-books, and have led to their general adoption in theological seminaries, reappear in this. The plan is simple, natural and philosophical. The learner is first of all confronted with the *facts*—that is, with a sufficient number of carefully chosen sentences or phrases, illustrating a definite *principle*. From a study of the facts he is prepared to see the principle they embody. The principles are then clearly and concisely stated, and by a well-arranged tabulation they correspond to the facts cited, so that no inconvenience is felt in passing from the one to the other. On each topic there are special remarks in which additional details, interesting comparisons and important exceptions are given. A most remarkable feature of the book is its "References for Study," consisting of a large number of texts which furnish the student with the opportunity of applying the principles he has learned. The work is admirably adapted to its purpose. We can conceive of nothing that will better answer the needs of both teacher and pupil.



It would be too much to say that the author's position will in every case be approved, for there is often a wide divergence of opinion among Hebrew scholars on questions of syntax. But it can hardly be doubted that the book will be found almost universally satisfactory, since it embodies, in a lucid form, the best results of the Hebrew scholarship of the age.

ROMANISM VERSUS THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM. By Daniel Dorchester, D.D. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1888. Price, \$1.25.

The author of this volume wrote and published a large work, "Christianity in the United States from the Earliest Settlement to the Present Time," and the present volume is the result of the material that came into his hands incidentally on this question of education, like Max Müller's "Chips from a German Workshop." We have found it to be very interesting, because it treats of a living question. We have by no means settled the question of our popular education; rather we are just at the beginning of the problem. There is no doubt, we think, that in their inception our public schools were designed to stand in close connection with the Christian Church, and hence to be Christian; but difficulties have sprung up in their practical operation, and now the theory is very general that no positive teaching on the subject of religion ought to be allowed in them. The Roman Catholic Church does not allow its members to send their children to these schools, and claims that the State should give to its parochial schools a *pro rata* share of the funds appropriated to the public schools. This is resisted by Protestants. This volume gives a very satisfactory history of the controversy down to the recent contest at the polls in Boston, where the women turned out to vote in large number. We recommend the volume to all who may wish to be fully informed on the subject.

REASONS FOR CHURCH CREED. A Contribution to Present Day Controversies. By Rev. R. J. Cooke, D.D. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1888. Price, 60 cents.

A little volume of ninety-two pages, in two parts. Part first answers the objections to Christian Creed; (1) from Agnostics; (2) from those who recognize no scientific certitude as to church doctrine; (3) from deistical thinkers; (4) from semi-Christian thinkers, and finally from those who claim that the Bible is sufficient without Creeds. The second part gives four positive reasons for the importance and necessity of Creeds. The discussion is able and interesting, and on an important subject, as the writer covers much of Christian Apologetics. He brings forward forcible arguments to prove that belief in Christianity is supported by reason quite as fully, to say the least, as the scientific theories that are freely ac-



cepted, and better supported than some of these theories, such, for instance, as that of evolution.

So, too, he shows that the historical *data* of Christianity are as well supported as the accepted narratives and facts of secular history. Of course the subject is too broad to be treated exhaustively within the compass of such a volume, but by taking up only the salient points the writer covers a great deal of ground, and holds the reader's attention to the close. It seeks to meet the latest objections to Christian faith, and, so far as it goes, we think with success.

**MENTAL EVOLUTION IN MAN.** *Origin of Human Faculty.* By George John Romanes, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S., Author of "Animal Intelligence," "Mental Evolution in Animals." New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1889. Price, \$3.00.

Dr. Romanes is an out-and-out Evolutionist. As such he made himself widely known by his two works in the "International Scientific Series," on the "Jelly-Fish, Star-Fish and Sea-Urchins," and on "Animal Intelligence," and by his work on "Mental Evolution in Animals." The present work moves in the same line of thought as the volumes just mentioned. In it the study of mental evolution is carried into the province of human psychology. Taking as granted the general theory of evolution as regards the whole of organic nature, morphological and psychological, with the one exception of man, an effort is made to prove that it holds true also of him not only as regards his corporeal, but even as regards his mental constitution. In other words, it is the object of the volume under consideration to prove that the mind of man is a mere development of that of the animal, and that the former differs from the latter not in kind, but merely in degree. In the discussion of the question Dr. Romanes shows himself a clear and acute thinker who is thoroughly acquainted with the subject of which he treats. His work accordingly will be found of unusual interest and value to all who are engaged in the thorough study of psychology. That there is a striking similarity between the mental construction of the animal and that of man up to a certain point, he very clearly shows. But he utterly fails, in our opinion, to prove that the higher development which manifests itself in man is the mere product of natural forces operating upon and active in the animal. And this, after all, it seems to us, is the point on which all turns. For, if man is not the mere product of the lower forces of nature, then he must have come into existence by a Divine fiat, and, if so, then, notwithstanding, the correspondences that exist between him and the lower orders of creation, he is yet essentially different from them, as is very clearly and positively taught in the Sacred Scriptures.

**THE LETTERS OF JESUS.** Lenten Lectures. By Joseph S. Seiss, D.D., LL. D., Author of "Lectures on the Gospels," "Lectures on the Epistles," "Voices from Babylon," "Lectures on the Apocalypse," etc., etc. Philadelphia: Lutheran Book-store. 1889. Price, \$1.25.

This is a handsome duodecimo volume of three hundred and forty-three pages. It is made up of twenty-one Lectures based on the second and third chapters of the Revelation of St. John the Divine. The Letters of Jesus of which it treats, accordingly, are the Epistles sent by the hand of the Apostle John to the seven Churches of Asia Minor. "These Letters," the author very truly remarks, "constitute a unique section of sacred literature. Like the Parables, they consist exclusively of Christ's own words; but, unlike the Parables, they were dictated from heaven after He was risen and glorified. They are perhaps the only unabridged records of His addresses that we possess. They are also so impressively introduced, and so particularly addressed to the Churches, as to imply that there is something in them of unusual solemnity and importance. They come to us with a seven-times-repeated admonition to hear them, and lay them to heart. As we have ears to hear, we are commanded to hear what the Spirit saith to the Churches."

The lectures in the volume before us on these sacred Letters were originally prepared for the author's week-day appointments during Lent. In their composition consequently the controlling aim was practical impression rather than critical elaboration, and hence throughout them the endeavor has been "to deal faithfully with the Divine Word without regard to anything else, to avoid all rashness and doubtful speculation, and to venture nothing on mere guess or conjecture." All the lectures are written in a clear and attractive style and are replete with important and impressive thought. They will be found both interesting and edifying reading, and deserve the attention of ministers and theological students on account of their homiletical merits. It would be well for the Church of Christ if preaching generally possessed more of the excellent qualities of these Lenten Lectures.

**OUR ENGLISH.** By Adams Sherman Hill, Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory in Harvard University. New York: Harper and Brothers, Franklin Square. 1889. Price, 75 cents.

This is an admirable little volume and deserves to be carefully read and studied by all who are interested in the correct use of the English language. It consists of five papers which originally appeared separately in different magazines, but are now properly published together in book-form. The different papers treat respectively of English in Schools, English in Colleges, English in Newspapers and Novels, English in the Pulpit, and Colloquial English. All of these papers are written in a clear, direct and for-

cible style and are unusually rich in important suggestions, which, if properly attended to, could not fail to be productive of great improvement in the art of speaking and writing correct and vigorous English. The book will be found especially valuable to parents, teachers and public speakers. The general reader, however, will also find it interesting and instructive. Those who begin reading it, we feel assured, will not be satisfied until they have read entirely through its attractive pages.

**THE PATH TO WEALTH; or, Light from my Forge.** A Discussion of God's Money Laws. The Relation between Giving and Getting. Cash and Christianity. By a Blacksmith. Also Additional Papers on Systematic Benevolence, written especially for this work by Rev. E. C. Hallam, Rev. F. R. Beattie, Ph.D. D.D., Rev. R. W. Woodsworth, Rev. John Pollard, D.D., and Rev. Wm. Taylor, Bishop of Africa. With an Introduction by Rev. J. H. Vincent, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of the M. E. Church, Chancellor of Chautauqua College of Liberal Arts, etc. B. F. Johnson & Co., Richmond, Va. Price, \$1.75.

The scope of this book is well set forth in the contents of the title-page, which we have given above in full. In it we have discussed, in a number of different treatises by different authors, God's monetary demands upon the people on the one hand, and the bearing of these demands upon our financial success on the other hand. The subject is very fully considered in its various relations, and much that is worthy of serious attention is presented in a forcible and interesting manner. Though we cannot accept as correct all the views maintained, yet we believe that the work as a whole, is calculated to do good and is deserving a place in every family library. Those especially, who are just starting out in life should carefully read it and consider well its teachings, as regards the path to wealth. The book is printed in large type, contains quite a number of illustrations and is well and handsomely bound in cloth.

**THE HOLY BIBLE.** Consisting of the Old and New Covenants, Translated according to the Letter and Idioms of the Original Languages. By Robert Young, LL.D., Author of several works in Hebrew, Chaldee, Samaritan, Syriac, Greek, Latin, Gujarati, etc. Revised Edition. Edinburgh: G. A. Young & Co., Bible Publishers. 1887. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 18 and 20 Astor Place. Price, \$4.00.

In the preface to this book, Dr. Young correctly remarks that "there are two modes of translation which may be adopted in rendering into our own language the writing of an ancient author: the one is to bring him before us in such a manner as that we may regard him as our own; the other, to transport ourselves, on the contrary, over to him, adopting his situation, modes of speaking, thinking, acting,—peculiarities of age and race, air, gesture, voice, &c." The latter is the mode adopted and admirably executed in the present volume, in which we have presented to us a strictly literal and idiomatic translation of the Hebrew and the Greek Texts

of the Old and New Testament Scriptures. It is accordingly a work of more than ordinary value and usefulness, and is especially suited to supply a deeply-felt want on the part of those who are not acquainted with the Hebrew and Greek languages, as in it they have as nearly as possible an exact counterpart of the original. When used in connection with the common English version and as auxiliary to it, as the author intends it should be, it can scarcely fail to make the meaning of the Sacred Scriptures more fully apparent and to add increased interest to their study. We heartily commend the book to all our readers as well worth possessing. Ministers and theological students especially will find it very convenient to have it within easy reach.

**THE LESSON COMMENTARY** on the International Sunday-school Lessons for 1889. By Rev. Jesse L. Hurlbut, D.D., and Rev. Henry M. Simpson, M.A. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1888. Price, \$1.25.

Of the various Lesson Commentaries for the present year this is one of the very best. It has not been prepared "to give the original thoughts of its editors, but to present the results of the most thorough scholarship, and the best thoughts of the best thinkers upon the lessons of the year." In its preparation more than one hundred and sixty distinguished authors, both old and new, were consulted and made to contribute of their intellectual and spiritual riches to its pages. Besides the lessons and the comments thereon the work also contains a number of very serviceable maps and many helpful illustrations. For the lessons of the first two quarters which are taken from the New Testament Scriptures the text of the Revised Version as well as that of the Authorized Version is given. To the comments on each lesson helpful references, practical thoughts and hints to teachers are added, which also are of much value. The Sunday-school teacher who uses this commentary in his preparation for teaching the different lessons of the year will, therefore, be well supplied with such information and instruction as is necessary to enable him to teach correctly and efficiently. As there is nothing of a sectarian character in the volume, it is suited to the wants of teachers of various Protestant denominations.

**THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE: Discourses upon Holy Scripture.** By Joseph Parker, D.D., Minister of the City Temple, Holborn Viaduct, London; author of "Ecce Deus," "The Paraclete," etc. Vol. IX. 1 Chronicles X.—2 Chronicles XX. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 18 and 20 Astor Place. 1888. Price, \$1.50.

This volume is characterized by the same qualities of thought and style that have made the previous volumes of the same series so popular and entertaining. Moreover, the fact that it relates to the most brilliant and attractive period in the history of the people of Israel gives it a special interest of its own. Among the subjects of

the various discourses of which it is chiefly composed are: Life a Battlefield, Spiritual Fortresses, Unrecorded Heroisms, Valiant Men, Misunderstood Men, How to Employ Old Age, Solomon's Choice, The Building of the Temple, The Queen of Sheba, Inspiration and Action, and Evil Compacts. As in the other volumes so in this most of the discourses are prefaced with a prayer, and there are the usual "Handfuls of Purpose." Those who have found instruction and delight in the earlier volumes will find the same in this.

THE NEW AFRICA: Its Discovery and Destiny. By Geo. Lansing Taylor, D.D., L.H.D. New York: Phillips & Hunt, Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1888. Price, 20 cents.

Among the great events in the history of the latter half of the nineteenth century the discoveries made in Africa unquestionably deserve a prominent place, and will, most probably, have an important bearing upon the future history of mankind. Some knowledge of them is therefore desirable on the part of all who would be well informed. To give such knowledge is the purpose of the little volume before us, which has been issued as a pamphlet of fifty-six pages. The substance of it originally appeared in the *Methodist Review* for May, July and September of the past year. It has been published in the present form because it has been found to meet a demand among intelligent people for a brief general survey of the history and results of recent explorations and discoveries in the dark continent. In a small compass it conveys much valuable information. It will be found to be very interesting as well as instructive reading.

LAUDES DOMINI; A Selection of Spiritual Songs, Ancient and Modern, for the Sunday-school. Edited by Charles Seymour Robinson. New York: The Century Company.

Of the many Song-books that have been published for the Sunday-school this is one of the very best. As implied by its name, it is designed to make prominent in Sunday-school worship the praise of the Lord Jesus Christ. Many of its hymns and tunes are taken from "Laudes Domini; a Selection of Spiritual Songs Ancient and Modern," and its publication is due, in a measure at least, to the feeling—which we are pleased to note is becoming stronger and stronger—that the hymns and tunes used in the Sunday-school should be of the same character as those used in the regular service of the Lord's Day and in the Prayer-meeting. It is a book of 255 pages, with 356 hymns and 312 tunes. It is supplied to Sunday-schools at introduction for 35 cents. We commend it to the attention of those who desire to introduce a new book into the Sunday-school.

COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT. Vol. I.,—Genesis and Exodus. By Milton S. Terry, D.D., and Fales H. Newhall, D.D. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1889. Price, \$2.25.

Whedon's Commentary on the New Testament is well and favorably known. This volume, which is published in uniform size and style, forms part of the same series on the Old Testament Scriptures. Of the various popular Commentaries that have appeared of late years on Genesis and Exodus, this is one of the very best. In a clear and simple manner it presents just such information as every Bible reader most requires. Though there is no perplexing display of learning to be found in its pages, yet all the best results of modern scholarship are embodied in its comments. For general use we know of no Commentary on the books of which it treats superior to it.

THE LIFE OF JOHN PRICE DURBIN, D.D., LL.D. With an Analysis of his Homiletic Skill and Sacred Oratory. By John A. Roche, M.D., D.D. With an Introduction by Randolph S. Foster, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1889. Price, \$1.50.

Among the gifted and eminent sons of American Methodism, a prominent position belongs to Dr. John P. Durbin. In the volume before us Dr. Roche gives an account of the life of this distinguished divine, and an analysis of his powers as a preacher. Both parts of the work have been unusually well done. The memoir is an exceedingly interesting one, and the pages devoted to Homiletics and Sacred Oratory are highly instructive. The book deserves to be widely circulated, and to be carefully read by all who would fully acquaint themselves with the secret of true success in the ministry. Theological students especially will be able to learn from it much that will be of real service to them. If the lives and methods of great preachers were more generally studied by those about to engage in the preaching of the gospel, there is every reason to believe the pulpit would greatly gain in power and efficiency.

JOHN THE BAPTIST, the Forerunner of our Lord: His Life and Work. By Ross C. Houghton, D.D., *Member of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, London, etc.*, Author of "Women of the Orient," "Ruth the Moabitess," etc. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1889. Price, \$1.50.

In this volume Dr. Houghton gives a very graphic and interesting account of the life and work of him of whom Jesus said: "Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater." The book conveys much important instruction, and is of a highly popular character. Those who begin to read it will hardly be willing to lay it aside before they have finished it. It is



especially well suited for the family and Sunday-school library, and ought to have a place in both.

**THE PHYSIOLOGY OF THE SOUL.** By J. H. Wythe, M.D., D.D., LL.D., Professor of Histology and Microscopy in Cooper Medical College, San Francisco. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1889. Price, \$1.25.

The object of this book is to promote positive Christian truth. Professor Wythe "is thoroughly convinced that the Christian philosophy which recognizes a personal Creator and the dualism of matter and spirit is the true interpreter of science, and that all real progress in knowledge is consistent with spiritual and eternal verities." The contents of his book are divided into six chapters, which treat respectively of "The Problem of Life," "Mind and Brain," "The Physiology of Consciousness," "Automatism and Freedom," "Heredity" and "The Biblical Psychology." Mind, Professor Wythe maintains, is not life, but the cause of life, and the Biblical dualism of spirit and matter he holds to be necessary to a true physiology. His treatment of the various subjects which he discusses is clear, calm and judicious. We commend his work to our readers as worthy of their attention. It will help them to understand more clearly some of the profound questions in psychology now claiming consideration.

**THE SABBATH. What—Why—How—Day—Reasons—Mode.** By M. C. Briggs, D.D. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1888. Price, 60 cents.

This little volume is a vigorous defence of the Christian Sabbath. In it the nature of the Sabbath, the reasons for its observance and the manner in which it should be observed are all clearly set forth. "The Sabbath, like marriage," Dr. Briggs claims, "was instituted in the time of man's innocence, and is as essential as marriage to the right ordering of human life." Accordingly he holds that "the right to legislate a civil Sabbath into being, and guard it against the conscienceless rapacity of bad men in bad business, is one feature of the right of self-protection which States as well as individuals enjoy." Its proper observance, he maintains, requires that it be made "a day of physical rest," and also "a day for worship and instruction in the sanctuary." In view of the increasing tendency to secularize the Sabbath, it would be well if this treatise could be widely circulated, and men and women generally could be induced to give proper attention to its forcible arguments; for there is little room to doubt that the interests of humanity demand a more faithful observance of the Lord's day.

**HOLINESS. As Understood by the Writers of the Bible. A Bible Study.** By Joseph Agar Beet. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1889. Price, 35 cents.

The purpose of this little book is to set forth the teaching of the



Bible about holiness. The conclusion which the author arrives at and maintains is that "holiness is God's claim to the ownership and the exclusive use of various men, things and portions of time, and that the objects claimed were called holy." This is not the ordinary view, and we are not prepared to accept its correctness; but we would nevertheless recommend this treatise to the attention of our readers, as an earnest and scholarly attempt to get at the true meaning of the Scripture teaching concerning holiness.

**CHURCH HISTORY.** By Professor Kurtz. Authorised Translation from latest Revised Edition by Rev. John Macpherson, M.A. In three volumes. Vol. I. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, 18 and 20 Aston Place, 1889. Price \$2.00.

The first edition of this work appeared in German in 1849, and at once met with much favor. In 1850 a second edition was issued of which an English translation was published in two volumes several years later. This translation has been widely used as a text-book, both in Great Britain and in America. Since it was made, however, the original work has been so enlarged and improved that Dr. Philip Schaff in a contribution to "The Independent," summer before last, said: "It is a shame that the English translation of Kurtz, which was made from the second edition, is still sold and used as a text-book in Scotland and America, although the author has long since not only doubled its size, but so entirely re-constructed the whole as to make the older editions useless and mischievous." The present volume is translated from the latest revised edition, the ninth, which was published in German in 1885, and in which Professor Kurtz claims to have made very special improvements on the presentation of the history of the first three centuries where ample use is made of the brilliant researches of Harnack and other distinguished scholars of the day. By the publication of this work, therefore, the cause of shame of which Dr. Schaff speaks is removed.

The work itself, it is scarcely necessary to say, is possessed of unusual merit. In a condensed form it presents a very full and accurate account of the history of the Christian Church. In the German Universities it has almost a monopoly as a text-book on the subject of which it treats. The first English volume is a reproduction without retrenchment of the original, and is an admirable translation of the same. It brings the history down to the close of the ninth century. The work should have a place in every educated man's library and will be found especially serviceable by ministers and theological students.

**MODERN SCIENCE IN BIBLE LANDS.** By Sir J. W. Dawson, LL.D., F.R.S., F.G.S., Author of "The Story of the Earth and Man," "The Origin of the World," etc. With Maps and Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, 1889. Price \$2.00.

In the preface to this book we are told that the motive to which

it owes its publication was "the desire of the author to share with others the pleasure and profit of a tour in Italy, Egypt and Syria, in which it was his special aim to study such points in geology and physical features of those countries as might throw light on their ancient history, and especially on the history of the sacred Scriptures." In it will be found much interesting and important information. Among the subjects discussed are "The Fire-Belt of Southern Europe," "The Haunts and Habits of Primitive Man," "Early Man in Genesis," "Egyptian Stones and their Teaching," "Palestine: Its Structure and History," and "Resources and Prospects of Bible Lands." On matters pertaining to Geology its conclusions may be received as those of an expert, but on questions of biblical interpretation and criticism its statements cannot be depended on as correct. The maps and the illustrations, of which there are a number, add to the value of the work.